

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A resolution (H. Res. 395) to pay Fannie A. Clarke \$32.25—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LATIMER: A concurrent resolution of the legislature of South Carolina, favoring an appropriation for a canal between the North Santee River and the South Santee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 13910) to remove the record of dishonorable discharges from the military records of John Shamburger, Louis Smith, and Henry Metzger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 13911) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca H. Stratton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13912) granting an increase of pension to Julia Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13913) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 13914) granting a pension to Sarah L. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13915) granting a pension to Nancy J. Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13916) granting an increase of pension to Frederick K. Noyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13917) granting an increase of pension to James A. Copen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13918) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John H. Ladd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAHLE: A bill (H. R. 13919) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Kelley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 13920) granting a pension to Helen A. B. Du Barry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 13921) granting a pension to Solomon Riddell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 13922) granting a pension to Lydia A. Magoon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 13923) granting a pension to Samuel B. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 13924) granting a pension to Jane Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13925) granting a pension to Richard Howell, alias George Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13926) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Moulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 13927) granting an increase of pension to Reverdy Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of the Savannah Cotton Exchange, favoring reduction of war-revenue tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARBER: Petition of 80 citizens of East Stroudsburg, Pa., asking for the abolishment of the traffic in liquor in Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolutions of the Savannah Cotton Exchange, in favor of amending the war-revenue reduction bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of the Nebraska State Board of Agriculture, against the distribution of common garden seeds by the Government—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of S. G. Cogizer and other citizens of Nebraska, favoring pensions to soldiers confined in Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letter of J. H. Worthen, asking for homestead legislation for veterans of the late civil war—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of W. C. Weir and others, of Laporte, Ind., in favor of the anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of gaugers, storekeepers, and storekeepers' gaugers of the Twenty-third internal-revenue district of Pennsylvania, in favor of legislation to authorize leaves of absence to said employees—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOVENER: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Wheeling, W. Va., in support of House bill No. 63, to provide for purchase of site and erection of public building thereon, in Wheeling, W. Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: Petition of 53 citizens of Hammondsport, N. Y., in favor of making provisions for an adequate

and permanent supply of water for the Pima and Papago Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Protest of 31 business men of Three Rivers, Mich., against the establishment of the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Lieutenant-Governor E. O. Keeler and others; C. L. Glover, mayor of Norwalk, and other citizens of Connecticut, in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 12743—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of New Jersey branch of Daughters of American Revolution, urging the passage of bill to make Valley Forge a national park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of 190 citizens of Jeannette, Pa., in favor of ratification of treaty which aims at the banishment of the traffic in alcoholic liquors from a great part of the continent of Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the internal-revenue gaugers, storekeepers, etc., of the Twenty-third revenue district of Pennsylvania, for sufficient appropriation to provide for their vacation without loss of pay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MANN: Resolutions of the Chicago Public Library, favoring the erection of a statue of Count Casimir Pulaski, a hero of the Revolutionary war—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Life Underwriters' Association of Chicago, Ill., urging the modification of the revenue law relating to stamp tax on life-insurance policies—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McALEER: Petitions of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., and the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring extension of the pneumatic-tube service in connection with the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Affidavit of Henry Kemper to accompany House bill No. 2202, correcting the military record of William Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of the Provident Trust Company, of Columbia City, Ind., favoring the repeal of stamp tax on checks, drafts, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Remonstrance of citizens of Connecticut against the passage of House bill No. 12743—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STARK: Protest of the Nebraska State board of agriculture against garden-seed appropriation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions of Northwestern Manufacturers' Association, of St. Paul, Minn., for the abolition of certain stamp taxes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the city council of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of the South Carolina-West Indian exposition—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of citizens of Idagrove, Iowa, urging the banishment of the liquor traffic in Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, relating to the tax on foreign exchange—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Josiah Strong, president of League for Social Service, and certain citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 30, 1901.

Prayer by Rev. STOWELL L. BRYANT, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

JAMES R. D. MORRISON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of James R. D. Morrison vs. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRACTION COMPANY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Capital Traction Company, of Washington, D. C., transmitting a statement of the receipts and disbursements of that company, together with a list of the stockholders, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1900; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

GERMAN ORPHAN ASYLUM ASSOCIATION.

The bill (H. R. 12899) to reincorporate and preserve all the corporate franchises and property rights of the de facto corporation known as the German Orphan Asylum Association of the District of Columbia was read twice by its title.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Committee on the District of Columbia has reported a bill, which is on the Calendar, identical with that bill. It is to revive the charter of a very worthy organization in the District. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It will take but a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read in full to the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. SPOONER. Is that a House bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a House bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is all right.

Mr. SPOONER. I know, but as I heard it read it creates a perpetual corporation without any reservation of the right to amend. Am I correct about that?

Mr. GALLINGER. What does the Senator mean? So far as Congress is concerned?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course Congress always reserves the right to amend.

Mr. SPOONER. It does if it does.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator mean to say that if it is not reserved in the act Congress will not have the right?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly I do, if Congress declares it shall be a perpetual corporation and does not reserve the right.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then let an amendment be inserted, that Congress hereby reserves the right to—what will the Senator suggest?

Mr. SPOONER. To alter, amend, or repeal.

Mr. GALLINGER. To alter, amend, or repeal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as an additional section the following:

SEC. —. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the bill (S. 5244) to reincorporate and preserve all the corporate franchises and property rights of the de facto corporation known as the German Orphan Asylum Association of the District of Columbia be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. BURROWS presented the credentials of JAMES McMILLAN, chosen by the legislature of the State of Michigan a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1901; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. CLAPP presented the credentials of KNUTE NELSON, chosen by the legislature of the State of Minnesota a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1901; which were read and ordered to be filed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2055) for the promotion and retirement of P. A. Surg. John F. Bransford, of the United States Navy.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 13193) to authorize the Director of the Census to make payments for information concerning cotton gins, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 13423) to revise and codify the laws relating to the Post-Office Department and postal service, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution requesting the President to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 5048) to confirm in trust to the city of Albuquerque, in the Territory of New Mexico, the town of Albuquerque grant, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of Charles Gurnee, Rev. R. E. King and sundry other citizens of Watertown, and of G. H. Jookup and sundry other citizens of Marion, all in the

State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of George Williamson Smith, president of Trinity College, and sundry other citizens of Hartford, Conn., praying that an appropriation be made providing for an adequate and permanent supply of living water for irrigation purposes for the Pima and Papago Indians in Arizona; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Colorado Springs and Colorado City, Colo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to the native races in Africa; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Niwot, Colo., praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LINDSAY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Elkton, Ky., praying that Hannah More, of that place, be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lee County, Ky., and a petition of sundry citizens of Bath County, Ky., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the bill providing for the creation of a new Federal judicial district in Kentucky, so as to substitute Winchester for Richmond as one of the places for holding court; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Lexington, Frankfort, and Lebanon, all in the State of Kentucky, and a petition of sundry citizens of New Albany, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Sheboygan, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics and also to protect free labor from prison competition; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of Borough Pomona Grange No. 11, Patrons of Husbandry, of Northboro, Mass., praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Indian Association of Amherst, Mass., praying that an appropriation be made providing for an adequate and permanent supply of living water for irrigation purposes for the Pima and Papago Indians in Arizona; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented the petition of N. M. Cummings and 23 other citizens of Lanesboro, Mass., praying for the repeal of the revenue tax on tea; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ELKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Littleton, W. Va., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly, American Federation of Labor, of Sparta, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to limit the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics, and also to protect free labor from prison competition; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry internal-revenue gaugers, storekeepers, and storekeeper gaugers of the Eighth collection district of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the provisions of the Revised Statutes, as recommended in the annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for 1900, so as to provide such additional appropriation for payment of officers of this class as will admit of granting a leave of absence with pay for two and one-half days for each month of thirty days that they are actually assigned to duty, and that they be allowed to claim in their pay accounts the maximum rate of pay allowed them under their assignments for such days as they may be granted leave, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of Eli Wicoff and 20

other citizens of Greenwood, Ind., and the petition of F. N. Kellogg and 56 other citizens of Bluffton, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DANIEL presented the petition of Hon. J. Hoge Tyler, governor of Virginia, and sundry citizens of Radford, Va., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of New River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to native races in Africa; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Charles S. Cole and 48 other pharmacists of Cumberland County, Me., praying for the repeal of the revenue-stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEMPLE FARM AND MOORE HOUSE, AT YORKTOWN, VA.

Mr. KENNEY. I present a joint resolution of the general assembly of the State of Delaware, to which I desire to call the attention of the Senators from Virginia. I ask that it may be read and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as follows:

Joint resolution requesting the Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Delaware, if in their judgment they can wisely do so, to support a bill for the purchase of Temple farm and Moore house, at Yorktown, Va., by the Government of the United States of America, provided that the cost of said farm, with its improvements, shall not exceed a reasonable sum, and that properly attested copies of these resolutions be sent to the Senator and Representative in Congress from this State.

Whereas the Moore house and Temple farm, upon which it is situated, at Yorktown, Va., will carry with them through all time memories of the siege and victory by which the allied armies of France and the American colonies secured the independence of our nation; and

Whereas it is reported that the property can at this time be bought for a nominal sum, and it is believed that the product of the farm will be sufficient to keep the buildings in repair, and the buildings are so situated as to be well adapted for Government purposes on occasions of naval inspection and review on York River: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Delaware in general assembly met, That the Senator and Representative in Congress from this State be, and they are hereby, requested to consider and, if in their judgment they can wisely do so, to support a bill for the purchase of Temple Farm and Moore House at Yorktown, Va., by the Government of the United States of America: *Provided,* That the cost of said farm with its improvements shall not exceed a reasonable sum; and be it

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the Senator and Representative in Congress from this State.

H. C. ELLISON,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
JAS. V. McCOMMONS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved this the 25th day of January, A. D. 1901.

JOHN HUNN, Governor.

STATE OF DELAWARE, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Caleb R. Layton, secretary of state of the State of Delaware, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of joint resolution requesting the Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Delaware, if in their judgment they can wisely do so, to support a bill for the purchase of Temple Farm and Moore House at Yorktown, Va., by the Government of the United States of America, provided that the cost of said farm with its improvements shall not exceed a reasonable sum; and that properly attested copies of these resolutions be sent to the Senator and Representative in Congress from this State, approved this the 25th day of January, A. D. 1901, as the same appears on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and official seal, at Dover, this 29th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1901.

C. R. LAYTON,
Secretary of State.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for the preparation and publication of the Revolutionary archives in the Department of State, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, reported an amendment proposing to pay \$4,000 to the Italian Government as full indemnity to the heirs of Joseph Defatta and John Cyrano, who were lynched by a mob at Tallulah, La., on July 20, 1899, intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, and moved that it be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 28th instant proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Lourenço Marquez from \$2,000 to \$2,500, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 19th instant providing for the appointment of a second secretary of legation at Constantinople, Turkey, at a salary of \$1,600, intended to be proposed to

the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 28th instant proposing to increase the salary of the United States minister to Bolivia from \$5,000 to \$7,500, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 28th instant proposing to increase the salary of the United States minister to Ecuador from \$5,000 to \$7,500, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10967) to authorize the Arizona Water Company to construct power plant on Pima Indian Reservation, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to report it without amendment. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read to the Senate. The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to ask what is the order of business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order of business is reports of committees.

Mr. STEWART. This bill is reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs. It is recommended by the Interior Department. There is no objection to it anywhere.

Mr. HALE. Why is it being read?

Mr. LODGE. Why is it being read now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Because the Senator from Nevada asked unanimous consent for its present consideration, and it is being read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts objects to the present consideration of the bill, and it goes to the Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 5797) to widen the Anacostia road in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. McMILLAN) on the 24th instant providing that hereafter all deaf mutes of teachable age, of good mental capacity, and properly belonging to the District of Columbia shall be received and instructed in the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, their admission thereto being subject to the approval of the superintendent of public schools, intended to be proposed to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. BACON on the 26th instant, proposing to appropriate \$3,000 for paving Crescent street west of Sixteenth street and \$5,000 for paving Huntington street, intended to be proposed to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, reported it without amendment, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. McMILLAN) on the 23d instant, proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for opening, grading, and macadamizing Connecticut avenue extended east of Rock Creek, intended to be proposed to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, reported it with amendments, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4733) granting a pension to Caroline H. Allen, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5356) granting a pension to Sarah Frances Taft; and
A bill (H. R. 12566) granting a pension to George M. Walker.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 296) granting an increase of pension to Mattie Otis Dickinson;

A bill (H. R. 5195) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Kouts; and

A bill (H. R. 11507) granting an increase of pension to Perry C. Jeffrey.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5647) granting a pension to Rebecca Dobbins, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KENNEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5010) granting a pension to Thomas E. Clark, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5383) granting a pension to Theopolis Goodwin, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. McMILLAN) on the 23d instant providing for the appointment of a stenographer at \$900 and two inspectors at \$720 each for the board of charities and corrections, for transferring the management of the Freedmen's Hospital from the Secretary of the Interior to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the purchase of a site in the District of Columbia for a municipal almshouse, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 971) to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4745) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Word; and

A bill (S. 5672) granting an increase of pension to Annie A. Neary.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4127) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Pierce, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TURLEY, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5345) to amend an act approved August 13, 1894, entitled "An act for the protection of persons furnishing materials and labor for the construction of public works," reported it without amendment.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11970) to authorize the Chattahoochee and Gulf Railroad Company, of Alabama, to construct a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River, a navigable stream in Geneva County, Ala., reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments:

A bill (H. R. 12284) authorizing construction of bridge; and

A bill (S. 5698) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 12577) granting a pension to Sarah B. Schaeffer;

A bill (H. R. 6914) granting an increase of pension to Elliott Loomis;

A bill (H. R. 3945) granting an increase of pension to Burdette N. Cleaveland; and

A bill (H. R. 9235) granting a pension to Peter Lundberg.

INSULAR TARIFF CASES.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] on the 22d instant, to report it favorably with an amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary proceeded to read the concurrent resolution, which is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed and bound, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 8,000 copies of the record and briefs in the following cases of the October term, 1900, in the Supreme Court of the United States, including the appendices thereto, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 5,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 500 copies for distribution by the Department of Justice, and 500 copies for distribution by the clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Elias S. A. De Lima et al. vs. George R. Bidwell, being case No. 456; Samuel B. Downes et al. vs. George R. Bidwell, being case No. 507; Henry W. Dooley et al. vs. The United States, being cases Nos. 501 and 502; Carlos Armstrong vs. The United States, being case No. 509; George W. Crossman et al. vs. The United States, being case No. 515; Christian Huus vs. The New York and Porto Rico Steamship Company, being case No. 514; John H. Goetze vs. The United States, being case No. 340, and Fourteen Diamond Rings, Emil J. Pepke, claimant, vs. The United States, being case No. 419.

The amendment was, in line 2, after the word "bound," to strike out "under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing."

Mr. HALE. Let the resolution go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will go to the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5798) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Kellogg Schenck;

A bill (S. 5799) granting a pension to Moses A. Lovelady (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5800) granting a pension to John Mather;

A bill (S. 5801) granting a pension to Charles Roden; and

A bill (S. 5802) granting a pension to James H. Wood.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5803) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Beaver (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 5804) granting a pension to George Hilbns; and

A bill (S. 5805) granting an increase of pension to William Mays.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 5806) to correct the military record of Samuel Snyder (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5807) to correct the military record of William B. Wesner.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 5808) granting an increase of pension to William P. Rucker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5809) granting a pension to Jane Lewis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5810) granting a pension to Mrs. John Waltz (with the accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 5811) granting a pension to Anna M. Hawes (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 5812) granting a pension to A. Crouch.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 5813) to correct the military record of William S. Reid; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 5814) to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 5815) for the relief of the estate of Franklin S. Whitney, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 5816) granting an increase of pension to William J. Bradford; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 5817) extending to the subport of Everett, Wash., the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 5818) to authorize the Bradshaw Mountain Railroad Company to construct a railroad through forest reserve and public lands of the United States in Yavapai County, Ariz., to Crowned King and other mining camps in said county; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the establishment of a psychophysical laboratory, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment authorizing the appointment to the Naval Academy of acting cadets who served with credit during the late war with Spain, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for paving Kraemer street, from Sixteenth to Seventeenth streets N.E., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$34,220 for the purchase and installation of water meters in public buildings belonging to or occupied by the United States in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$200,000 for improving the Anacostia River in the District of Columbia and the reclamation of its flats, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$700,000 for a sewage-disposal system in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LINDSAY (by request) submitted an amendment authorizing proceedings to be instituted in the supreme court of the District of Columbia with a view to the condemnation of the land that may be necessary for the extension of Vermont avenue from Florida avenue, intended to be proposed to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADVANCES FOR DISTRICT GOVERNMENT.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13371) to authorize advances from the Treasury of the United States for the support of the government of the District of Columbia; which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

PRINTING OF SHIPPING BILL.

On motion of Mr. FRYE, it was

Ordered, That 500 copies, in addition to the usual number, of Senate bill 727, known as the shipping bill, as amended, be printed for the use of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF PORTO RICO.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to inform the Senate whether the executive council of Porto Rico has undertaken to guarantee dividends to corporations doing business in that island; and if so, to state all the facts to the Senate;

And also, whether said executive council has donated public property of any character to any individuals, firms, or corporations; and if so, to state the quantity and character of such public property so proposed to be donated, and its value;

And also, by what authority of law any of said acts have been done by said executive council.

TOWN OF ALBUQUERQUE GRANT.

Mr. BERRY. There was a concurrent resolution to recall a bill that is in the hands of the President, which passed the House, and it is necessary that it should be passed at once in order that it may go to the President. I ask that it may be laid before the Senate and considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 5048) entitled "A bill to confirm in trust to the city of Albuquerque, in the Territory of New Mexico, the town of Albuquerque grant, and for other purposes."

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will let this resolution be passed. It is for the return of a bill that is in the hands of the President. The House of Representatives passed it, and it will not take two minutes, not one minute, to dispose of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Objection has already been made to the consideration of two or three other bills.

Mr. BERRY. This is a resolution for the return of a bill that has gone to the President. The return is necessary in order to correct an error. I trust the Senator will let it pass. It could have been passed by this time.

Mr. ALDRICH. All right.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN H. HOFFECKER.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that on Saturday, the 16th of February, I will call up the resolutions of the House of Representatives announcing the death of my late colleague in the House, Hon. JOHN H. HOFFECKER, and will ask the Senate to suspend its proceedings in order that fitting tribute may be paid to his memory.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 1400) granting a pension to William Lyman Chittenden.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13193) to authorize the Director of the Census to make payments for information concerning cotton gins, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Census.

The bill (H. R. 13423) to revise and codify the laws relating to the Post-Office Department and postal service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. HAWLEY. I lay before the Senate the conference report upon the so-called Army reorganization bill, and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut presents the report of the conferees on the Army reorganization bill. It will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4300) to increase the military establishment of the United States, and read to the action upon amendment numbered 45:

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it is absolutely impossible for us to know anything about the conference report, being read as it is by the Clerk with extreme rapidity and without any opportunity to refer to the printed bill or the amendments to see what changes have been made. It seems to me that the committee ought at least to call the attention of the Senate to such action as it has taken upon the amendments of the Senate in order that we may know what has been done.

Mr. ALDRICH. The conference report has to be read first.

Mr. BACON. Is it the purpose, then, to give us that information and to go over it again?

Mr. ALDRICH. I take it for granted that the committee will make such explanations as are necessary.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will try to answer all questions that are put.

Mr. BACON. I was simply suggesting that we ought to know something about the action of the conference with reference to the amendments which the Senate has acted upon. We can not tell anything by simply hearing the report read and having reference made to the amendments by number, and passed over at the rate of ten per minute. While we may not be interested in knowing what the House conferees have given away, it may be important for us to know what the Senate conferees have done in that regard.

Mr. HAWLEY. We printed and laid on the desk of Senators the bill in four forms, and every bit of action upon it is set forth in those four bills.

Mr. BACON. When, I would ask the Senator?

Mr. HAWLEY. I found it on my desk about three legislative days since.

Mr. BACON. It is understood that the conference committee acted only yesterday finally. I have no design to stop the reading of the report if it is the purpose of the committee after the reading to explain the amendments, so that we can see what the conference committee has done. I think it is asking too much of the Senate, without any reference whatever by the committee to the particular amendments of the Senate from which the conferees on the part of the Senate have receded, to say that we should indorse their action.

It may be all right, and I do not mean to suggest by this interruption that there is any failure of the committee to sustain the Senate in important amendments, but I do think we ought at least to be informed of the action of the conference. If it is the purpose of the committee after the reading of the report to give us information upon the important matters that were discussed at some length here and the amendments which were adopted, of course I do not wish to interrupt the reading.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the Senator will yield to me a moment I will state that every day for several days a copy of the bill has been laid upon every Senator's desk, and another copy is coming around now, which gives all the amendments, and a copy of the report.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. But the Senator from Connecticut will recognize the fact that many of us who are not familiar with the bill have some difficulty in understanding the effect of amendments. As I understand it, the desire of the Senator from Georgia is that the chairman of the committee shall explain to the Senate the effect of those amendments after the report has been read. It seems to me that is the usual practice and there can be no difficulty about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will continue the reading.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the report and read to the action upon amendment numbered 49.

Mr. BUTLER. Unless the chairman of the committee desires a different course, to wait until the report is read through, I should like an explanation of the action of the Senate conferees in receding from amendment 49.

Mr. HAWLEY. Has the reading of the report been completed?

Mr. BUTLER. Does the chairman prefer to have the reading finished?

Mr. HAWLEY. I hope that will be done. If the report has to be read, let it be read before we begin to discuss the items.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the report, and after reading the action upon amendment numbered 53,

Mr. BATE. Which item is the Secretary reading? I am trying to find it and can not. There are two or three bills around here. I have three bills before me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not able to inform the Senator.

Mr. BATE. I should like to know.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary is reading the report of the conference committee.

Mr. BATE. It gives the line and all that, but I can not find it.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the report and was interrupted by

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the same thing the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] called attention to. I have three copies of the bill, including the last print, and the pages do not correspond to the pages in the report that the Secretary is reading. For instance, the Senate amendment on which the action of the conferees has just been read, wherein they have receded and yielded to the House, and not only yielded but they have actually legislated, because it does not seem to me that they could have done in conference what is done here, is on page 11, the conference report says, while in the bill it is on page 16. I just happened to find it. With great difficulty I have been trying to keep up with the Secretary. Here is one of the most important changes in the bill, and by accident I just happened to see it on page 16 of the print of the bill that I have, while the report says it is on page 11.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I may be allowed to observe that the substance of the bill has been twice passed by the House and there has been three or four editions of it. In some cases the changes were such that the paging had to be changed.

Mr. BUTLER. I have just been informed that the numbering of the pages in the conference report is based not on the last bill, but the original bill. That may be the custom, but I never so understood it. It certainly makes it very difficult for Senators to keep up with the conference report. If we are to have the numbering of the pages of the original bill, then there should be double numbers, the pages of the original bill and the last print of the bill, so that we can keep up with what the conferees have done while the Secretary reads the report.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can help the Senator, if he will allow me. There is being laid upon the desk—perhaps it is completed now—an edition of the bill as it passed, the completed bill reported by the conferees.

Mr. BUTLER. I have it in my hand.

Mr. HAWLEY. An edition is printed in which the pages stand opposite each other, so that to see what changes there are you have only to look on the opposite page. The whole bill is printed in that form.

Mr. BUTLER. I have the last print containing copies of the two bills, one bill on one page and the other on the other. As to the amendment now under consideration, the Secretary has been reading as if it were on page 11, and yet it is on page 16 in both prints.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator will allow me, if he will note the numbers of the amendments rather than the pages, I think it will avoid all difficulty and confusion.

Mr. BUTLER. Probably I may be able to keep track of the matter in that way.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator can do so by following the numbers of the amendments rather than the pages of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I certainly think it would be better for the Secretary not to read the pages at all, for it is confusing.

Mr. BATE. I was watching the reading as carefully as I could, and I could not find a single one of the amendments. So far as the reading is concerned, it has been all Greek to me.

Mr. BUTLER. I call attention to the fact that the amendment now under consideration is on page 16 of the printed bill.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from North Carolina will allow me, if he will be guided by the numbers, I think his difficulty will be obviated.

Mr. BUTLER. Where are the numbers shown?

Mr. SPOONER. On the margin.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it would be very much better for the Secretary to omit reading the number of the page at all, and simply read the number of the amendment, for it is confusing to have the pages called when they do not correspond with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will be obliged to read the conference report as it is. He can not change it. The reading will be resumed.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the report of the conference committee, and read the action of the conferees on amendment numbered 54.

Mr. BATE. I can not find out where the amendments come in, and nobody around me knows.

Mr. BURROWS. If Senators will take the print laid on their tables this morning and turn to page 16 they will find amendment numbered 54 on page 16.

Mr. BACON. I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that that is the first announcement now of the present status of the bill.

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. And we have gone over 16 pages—

Mr. BURROWS. That is all true.

Mr. BACON. And up to this time it has been utterly and practically impossible for any Senator to follow the Secretary and see what the action of the conference has been.

Mr. BURROWS. That is so.

Mr. BACON. And are we to be called upon to indorse the report without knowing anything about it?

Mr. BURROWS. Commencing at this point there will be no difficulty in following the reading of the Secretary and seeing what has been done.

Mr. BATE. But what about the part we have gone over?

Mr. HAWLEY. In the RECORD this morning Senators will find that all the changes made by the conference report are noted and the substance of them given. By reading that they can very readily understand what has been done.

Mr. BATE. We did not know that before.

Mr. HAWLEY. For instance, Senators will find:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are simply verbal and to cover all the Army as now organized. House recedes.

No. 3 changes a corps of artillery to regimental organizations, and Senate recedes.

No. 4 is simply a verbal change, and House recedes. The same is true of No. 5, and House recedes.

No. 6 includes Indian scouts, and House recedes—

That was by an accident left out in the copying—

No. 7 enlarges power of detail for surplus captains and lieutenants, and House recedes.

No. 8 relates to regimental reorganization for artillery, and Senate recedes. This leaves the corps organization as provided by the House—

The conference committee changed this. We gave up trying to maintain the old regiments, as the Senate wanted to do, and constituted one great corps of artillery—

No. 9 on same subject. Senate recedes.

No. 10 on same subject. Senate recedes.

No. 11 on same subject. Senate recedes with amendments striking out "an inspector," in line 23, page 13, and inserting the words "a chief." Also in line 3, page 24, strike out "inspector" and insert "chief." Also on page 14, line 4, strike "eighty-two" and insert "ninety-five." Also on same page, line 5, strike out "ninety-eight" and insert "ninety-five"—

These are changes in the numbers of the officers—

Also on same page, line 6, strike out "ninety-two" and insert "ninety-five." These three amendments make the captains, first and second lieutenants in artillery conform to organization provided for infantry and cavalry—

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. HAWLEY. Let me insert one further:

Nos. 12 and 13 refer to artillery organization, and Senate recedes on both. Nos. 14 and 15 are artillery, and Senate recedes.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator when he is making the statement he has just made about striking out, for instance, "92" and inserting "95," does he mean by that when the number 92 has been agreed to by both Houses the committee of conference has changed that and made it 95?

Mr. HAWLEY. We did not make the change.

Mr. HALE. I wish the Senator would go back. My attention was called away from what he did say. They struck out so many, he said, and inserted another number, which was a larger number. What I want to know is whether the conferees, where a certain number has been fixed in a corps by both Houses, has deliberately put in a larger number? That clearly can not be done by a conference committee.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think it has not been done.

Mr. HALE. That was the understanding I got from the Senator from Connecticut. I hope I will be corrected and that no such thing has been done.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator will allow me, I will state how it is.

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. The whole system of the artillery was changed. The House passed the bill providing a system of corps artillery, and the Senate established one by regiments, naming the number of officers for each regiment. We receded from our amendment and adopted the House corps provision with certain amendments.

Mr. HALE. In adopting the House amendments did the committee increase the number in any rank above anything that either the House or the Senate had done?

Mr. PROCTOR. The number of officers in the Senate was fixed by regiments. We have no such provision as that of the House. Ours was a regimental organization. We gave that up entirely; and that required, of course, some slight difference in the number of officers.

Mr. HALE. Now, is the number that the conference committee put in a larger number of officers than was provided either in

the House provision by a corps or the regimental provision of the Senate? Has the conference increased the number of officers over both of those provisions?

Mr. PROCTOR. I am not able to say without having figured it up, and it would be a matter of figuring by regiments. We gave up the whole regimental system and adopted the corps system, with certain amendments.

Mr. HALE. The conference committee adopted the House amendments, but added to the number of officers.

Mr. HAWLEY. I know the committee sat down and declared that they would receive no new legislation and no proposition for new legislation; that they would confine themselves to correcting the errors.

Mr. HALE. I do not object; but I see the force, if there were two systems, one in one bill and another in the other, in accepting one system and giving up another; adaptations would naturally have to be made; but I do object in any of these adaptations to taking advantage of the powers that a conference has of putting in a larger number of officers in any of these lines than either House has provided.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Is not that just what the conference committee did?

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] thinks not. I do not know.

Mr. BUTLER. I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that it seems to have been done in other places in the bill. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont to reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am informed by the clerk of the conference committee, who has the record, that in considering the different ranks and grades in this corps the aggregate has not been increased, according to what one House or the other had provided for.

Mr. BUTLER. The point the Senator is making is this, whether or not the conferees have legislated about things that were not in conference. Do not his remarks apply equally in case the conferees have made any change in the Senate bill as to which the House and the Senate were agreed when the bill went to conference? Any other changes, I take it, they would have no right to make.

On page 3, section 2, line 13, there is "1 color-sergeant" stricken out and "2 color-sergeants" put in the bill.

Mr. HALE. Put in by the conferees?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; put in by the conferees.

Mr. HALE. That they have clearly no right to do.

Mr. HAWLEY. That results from the change in the organization, two being required in one form of the organization and only one in the other. These are the natural numbers in such an organization.

Mr. BUTLER. I am referring to section 2, line 13, on page 3.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am not familiar enough with cavalry to state exactly why that was done. That is merely a change from "1 color-sergeant" to "2 color-sergeants," which was made because a regiment of cavalry is entitled to that number.

Mr. BUTLER. But, Mr. President, here is the House bill [exhibiting], and on the left-hand side "1 color-sergeant" is provided for in the bill as it passed the Senate and went to the conference, and on the right-hand side in the other bill it is "2 color-sergeants."

Mr. HAWLEY. If the Senator will look at page 3, he will find that the regiments of cavalry are organized in section 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the Secretary has not finished the reading of the conference report.

Mr. HAWLEY. The House struck out something of the paragraph on page 3, indicated by the heavy brackets; then the House receded, and adopted that with an amendment for 2 color-sergeants instead of 1, because that particular organization of cavalry is entitled to 2 color-sergeants, for it has a United States flag and a regimental flag.

Mr. BUTLER. The point I make is, whether it is competent for a committee of conference to do that when here is legislation identical by both Houses, and it goes to a conference committee providing for 1 color-sergeant and then the conference committee changes it and provides for 2?

As we proceed with the bill we note these various things. We want to proceed intelligently, otherwise when we have finished the reading of the bill we shall be no wiser than we were before it was read through. In this bill, in more than one place, changes have been made. It seems to me, as I understand conference reports, that that is something a conference committee can not do, and should it do so, the bill would have to go back to conference.

Mr. CHANDLER. I rise to a question of order, Mr. President. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire will state his point of order.

Mr. CHANDLER. My point of order is that the report should be read through before it is debated.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I was simply asking for information in order to expedite business. I am willing to waive the point I make now and raise it again when the reading of the report has been concluded.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] in asking that the entire report be read, if after the report is read through we may go back to the beginning and go over it again. But if that is not to be done it occurs to me that it does not do justice to the Senate; and this report should now be read from the beginning for the reason which I now state. That reason is that up to the sixteenth page the reading had progressed under circumstances when it was impossible for Senators to know what was being done.

Until the Senators in charge of the report pointed out to other Senators in what way we could identify the various provisions specified in the report with the original text, we knew nothing about what was going on; in other words, the pages which the Clerk was reading were altogether different from the pages or the subject-matter which was found on the page of the bill which was before us, and it was not until the suggestion was made that by ignoring the pages and limiting ourselves to identification of the sections that we were enabled to find out in any manner whatever what it was the report referred to. There have been 16 pages gone over, and with utmost diligence and effort on our part to find out what the conference report had determined it was impossible for us to do so up to that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator demand the rereading of the report?

Mr. BACON. I do, unless it is to be subsequently gone over. I certainly think it is proper that we should do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. After the conference report shall have been read it will be open to the fullest consideration, if the Senate proceeds to its consideration.

Mr. BACON. That may be true, but how is it possible for us, with the report being read as rapidly as the Secretary has been reading it, and already having progressed sixteen pages without our being able to supervise what has been done—

Mr. HAWLEY. I did not finish my proposition. After the reading shall have been finished, then we shall go back to any single item you please, beginning at the middle or the end and going back.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator, after the reading of the report, will give us time to go over it again, all right.

Mr. HAWLEY. I supposed that was understood. That is the right of every Senator, and I can not give it or take it away.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. I merely desire to say a word and will not detain the Senate. If the report is to be taken up and acted upon immediately after the reading by the Secretary, evidently the suggestion of the Senator will not be practical, because we will have no opportunity to examine it. If the purpose is simply to read the report over and then to lay it aside long enough to permit us to examine it, there will be no objection to that suggestion, so far as I can see.

Mr. LODGE. I rise simply to a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. This is a conference report—a privileged question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. LODGE. Therefore it must be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It must be read.

Mr. LODGE. And after that nothing is in order to displace it except the question of consideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. TELLER. It seems to me that we are falling into a very curious method of doing business in asking a committee if they are going to allow us to make an examination of this report after the reading is concluded. That is our right. The committee can not take it away from us.

Mr. HAWLEY. I just said that we could not grant it or take it away.

Mr. TELLER. I am not blaming the Committee on Military Affairs. We have had a bill here as to which we made a stipulation with the Chair that we might have the right to do what the rules of this Senate give us the right to do; that is, to make amendments. We have an unquestioned right to attack this report in every feature of it and in every part of it, and as long as anybody is on the floor attacking it there can be no vote upon it. We are not at the mercy of the committee. We are accepting nothing from the committee as a gratuity or a gift. All we have got to do is to insist upon our rights.

Mr. CHANDLER. I renew the point of order I made, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. I rise to another parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. Is the report debatable while it is being read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not. In the opinion of the Chair, a conference report must first be read. Then, if the Senate desires to consider the report, every portion of it is open to consideration beyond any question.

Mr. HAWLEY. That is what I have said.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is the reading of the conference report. The Secretary will proceed with the reading.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the report. The entire report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments to the amendments of the House numbered 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 27, 28, 30, 63, 67, 69, 70, 87, and 114.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 68, 71, 73, 74, 78, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2, section 2, line 10, strike out "one color sergeant" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "two color sergeants;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out amended as follows: On page 4, line 9, strike out "an inspector" and insert in lieu thereof "a chief;" on page 4, section 6, line 14, strike out "inspector of the" and insert in lieu thereof "chief of;" on page 4, section 6, line 15, strike out "eighty-two" and insert in lieu thereof "ninety-five;" on page 4, section 6, line 16, strike out "ninety-eight" and insert in lieu thereof "ninety-five;" on page 4, section 6, line 17, strike out "ninety-two" and insert in lieu thereof "ninety-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 9, section 1, line 1, after the word "major-general," strike out "during the service of the present incumbent of the office and with the rank of brigadier-general thereafter" and insert in lieu thereof "and when a vacancy shall occur in the office of Adjutant-General on the expiration of the service of the present incumbent, by retirement or otherwise, the Adjutant-General shall thereafter have the rank and pay of a brigadier-general;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said section insert the following: "or of persons from civil life who at date of appointment are not over 35 years of age and who shall pass a satisfactory examination to be prescribed by the Secretary of War;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, section 12, line 1, strike out "quartermasters" and insert in lieu thereof "assistant quartermasters-general;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, section 12, line 2, strike out "quartermasters" and insert in lieu thereof "deputy quartermasters-general;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, section 12, line 3, in lieu of the number proposed by said Senate amendment insert "twenty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, section 12, line 3, in lieu of the number proposed by said Senate amendment insert "sixty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, section 12, line 10, after the word "fill," insert "original;" on page 11, section 12, line 12, after the word "appoint," strike out "persons who have, at any time, served as volunteers subsequent to" and insert in lieu thereof "officers of volunteers commissioned in the Quartermaster's Department since;" on page 11, section 12, line 13, after the word "ninety-eight," insert "Provided further, That the President is authorized to continue in service, during the present emergency, for duty in the Philippine Islands and on transports, 24 captains and assistant quartermasters of volunteers. This authority shall extend only for the period when their services shall be absolutely necessary;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, section 13, line 16, after the word "three," strike out "commissaries" and insert in lieu thereof "assistant commissaries-general;" on page 11, section 13, line 16, after the word "four," strike out "commissaries" and insert in lieu thereof "deputy commissaries-general;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, section 13, line 24, after the word "fill," insert "original;" on page 12, section 13, line 1, after the word "appoint," strike out the words "persons who have at any time served as volunteers subsequent to" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "officers of volunteers commissioned in the Subsistence Department since;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 12, section 14, line 6, strike out the first word of said line, "surgeons," and insert in lieu thereof "assistant surgeons-general;" on page 12, section 14, line 6, after the word "twelve," strike out "surgeons" and insert in lieu thereof "deputy surgeons-general;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 to the amendment of the House,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 13 section 14, line 5, after the word "captain," insert "mounted;" on page 13, section 14, line 9, after the word "necessary," insert "Provided further, That assistant surgeons in the Volunteer Army of the United States commissioned by the President as captains, in accordance with the provisions of an act for increasing the efficiency of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes, approved March 2, 1899, shall be entitled to the pay of a captain, mounted, from the date of their acceptance of such commission, as prescribed by law;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 16, section 17, line 19, strike out the first word of said line, "paymasters," and insert in lieu thereof "assistant paymasters-general;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 16, section 17, line 20, strike out "paymasters" and insert in lieu thereof "deputy paymasters-general;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 18, section 19, line 12, after the word "shall," insert "as far as possible;" on page 18, section 19, line 12, after the word "promotion," strike out "and appointment" and insert in lieu thereof "according to seniority;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 18, section 20, line 16, in lieu of the number proposed by said Senate amendment insert "four."

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 18, section 20, line 16, in lieu of the number proposed by said Senate amendment insert "fourteen;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 18, section 20, line 16, in lieu of the number proposed by said Senate amendment insert "fourteen."

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 19, section 20, line 2, after the word "ninety-eight," strike out "but no such person shall be appointed until he shall have passed a satisfactory examination as to his physical, moral, and professional qualifications, and no person not now or previously in the Regular Army shall be appointed to the grade of captain or first lieutenant in the Signal Corps after he shall have reached the age of 40 years," and amend the proviso at the end of said section to read as follows: "Provided, That the President is authorized to continue in service during the present emergency, for duty in the Philippine Islands, 5 volunteer signal officers with the rank of first lieutenant and 5 volunteer signal officers with the rank of second lieutenant. This authority shall extend only for the period when their services may be absolutely necessary."

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 19, section 22, line 13, after the words "Signal Corps," insert the following: "including those appointed to original vacancies in the grades of captain and first lieutenant under the provisions of sections 12, 13, 17, and 20 of this act."

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 11 of said amendment, after the word "corps," insert: "after the original vacancies created by this act shall have been filled." In line 16 of said amendment strike out "unless sooner relieved."

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Persons not over 40 years of age who shall have at any time served as volunteers subsequent to April 21, 1898, may be ordered before boards of officers for such examination as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and those who establish their fitness before these examining boards may be appointed to the grades of first or second lieutenant in the Regular Army, taking rank in the respective grades according to seniority as determined by length of prior commissioned service; but no person appointed under the provisions of this section shall be placed above another in the same grade with longer commissioned service, and nothing herein contained shall change the relative rank of officers heretofore commissioned in the Regular Army."

"Enlisted men of the Regular Army or Volunteers may be appointed second lieutenants in the Regular Army to vacancies created by this act, provided that they shall have served one year, under the same conditions now authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army."

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 24, section 25, line 13, after the word "may," insert "upon his own application;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of said amendment, after the word "and," insert "by and with the consent of the Senate;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore all of the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made for the purpose of selecting four sites with a view to the establishment of permanent camp grounds for instruction of troops of the Regular Army and National Guard, with estimates of the cost of the sites and their equipment with all modern appliances, and for this purpose is authorized to detail such officers of the Army as may be necessary to carry on the preliminary work; and the sum of \$10,000 is hereby appropriated for the necessary expense of such work, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall report to Congress the result of such examination and surveys, and no contract for said sites shall be made nor any obligation incurred until Congress shall approve such selections and appropriate the money therefor."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1034: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1034 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 27, section 31, line 10, after the word "companies," strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 27, section 31, line 14, after the word "volunteers," strike out "during or since the war with Spain" and insert in lieu thereof "subsequent to April 21, 1898;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107 to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 28, section 32, line 12, after the word "island," insert "as far as practicable;" and the Senate agree to the same.

JOS. R. HAWLEY,
REDFIELD PROCTOR,
F. M. COCKRELL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. A. T. HULL,
W. P. BROWNLOW,
JAMES HAY,

Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the report of the conference committee.

Mr. HAWLEY. The House, or rather a certain other legislative body, has a rule requiring an explanatory statement with every conference report. Such a statement will be found in the RECORD this morning on page 1643. I started to read a specimen of it, but it may be read in full from the desk. In some cases the reasons for the changes are very clearly given; but in others, where there is a change of perhaps an "8" to a "6," the explanation may not convey any idea. If any Senator wishes it, that can be read. I hold in my hand the report made in the House giving the reasons, so far as they can be given, for the changes made.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest that the Secretary be asked to read that.

Mr. HAWLEY. I was going to ask that the Secretary read that.

Mr. BUTLER. Before that is read, I think we will probably get along faster if the Secretary will read the conference report from the beginning down to page 16, at the point where our attention was directed to the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina asks that the conference report as far as page 16—

Mr. BUTLER. To the action on amendment numbered 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That the conference report may be read again down to the action on amendment numbered 54. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the report to the point indicated.

The Secretary read from the report of the conferees to the action on amendment numbered 54.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the point, I think, where we got the sections right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will now read the paper sent up by the Senator from Connecticut, if there is no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. I call the attention—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut asked, before the Senator from North Carolina rose, that a paper which he sent to the desk be read. If there is no objection, the Secretary will read the paper.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are simply verbal and to cover all the Army as now organized. House recedes.

No. 3 changes a corps of artillery to regimental organizations, and Senate recedes.

No. 4 is simply a verbal change, and House recedes. The same is true of No. 5, and House recedes.

No. 6 includes Indian scouts, and House recedes.

No. 7 enlarges power of detail for surplus captains and lieutenants, and House recedes.

Mr. BACON. I think the section which has just been passed over is the one to which the Senator from North Carolina or the Senator from Maine, I have forgotten which, called the attention of the committee, in order to ascertain whether or not the number had not been increased over that which was specified in the bill or the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading will be proceeded with.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the paper, as follows:

No. 8 relates to regimental reorganization for artillery, and Senate recedes. This leaves the corps organization as provided by the House.

No. 9 on same subject. Senate recedes.

No. 10 on same subject. Senate recedes.

No. 11 on same subject. Senate recedes with amendments striking out "an inspector," in line 23, page 13, and inserting the words "a chief." Also in line 3, page 24, strike out "inspector" and insert "chief." Also on page 14, line 4, strike out "eighty-two" and insert "ninety-five." Also on same page, line 5, strike out "ninety-eight" and insert "ninety-five." Also on same page, line 6, strike out "ninety-two" and insert "ninety-five." These three amendments make the captains, first and second lieutenants in artillery conform to organization provided for infantry and cavalry.

Nos. 12 and 13 refer to artillery organization, and Senate recedes on both. Nos. 14 and 15 are artillery, and Senate recedes.

Nos. 16, 17, and 18 are simply renumbering section and making verbal changes, and House recedes.

No. 19 is simply renumbering section.

No. 20 enlarges power of detail of surplus officers, and House recedes.

Nos. 21 and 22 are verbal only, and House recedes.

No. 23 designates what officers can be detailed, and House recedes.

No. 24 simply renumbers section.

No. 25 fixes pay of adjutants, quartermasters, and commissaries in engineer battalions. House recedes.

No. 26 simply renumbers section.

Nos. 27 and 28 refer to artillery organization, and Senate recedes.

No. 29 relates to age of chaplain, and House recedes.

No. 30 relates to artillery organization, and Senate recedes.

No. 31 relates only to number of section.

No. 32 relates to rank of Adjutant-General, and Senate recedes, with an amendment which makes it clear that when the office is again filled the rank shall be that of a brigadier-general only.

No. 33 relates only to number of section.

Nos. 34, 35, and 36 relate to title and numbers in Inspector-General's Department, and House recedes.

No. 37 relates only to number of section.

Nos. 38, 39, 40, and 41 are verbal changes only.

No. 42 relates to appointments in Judge-Advocate's Department, and House recedes with an amendment which will in the future open appointments in this corps to persons from civil life not over 35 years of age.

No. 43 relates to details from the line in Judge-Advocate's Corps, and House recedes.

No. 44 relates to number of the section.

Nos. 45, 46, 47, and 48 relate to number of officers in each grade in Quartermaster-General's Department, and leaves the number at 6 colonels, 9 lieutenant-colonels, 20 majors, and 60 captains, with a proviso that the Secretary of War may retain 24 captains of volunteers in the service so long as may be necessary, and in line 18, page 23, inserts the word "original" before the word "vacancies."

No. 49 is amended so it shall read "officers of volunteers commissioned in the Quartermaster's Department since April 21, 1898."

Nos. 51 and 52 limit the number of commissary sergeants to those now authorized by law, and the House recedes.

No. 53 is amended so as to read "officers of volunteers commissioned in Subsistence Department since April 21, 1898."

No. 54 relates to number of section.

No. 55, House recedes with an amendment which provides for paying volunteer captains the salary of their rank, and inserting, in line 24, page 25, the word "mounted" after the word "captain."

No. 56 increases the number of hospital stewards, and the House recedes.

No. 57 relates to number of section.

No. 58 provides that the head of Army nurse corps shall be a graduate of a nurses' training school. House recedes.

No. 59 relates to the veterinary corps, and House recedes.

No. 60 establishes the grade and regulates the number of veterinarians, and House recedes.

No. 61 relates to number of section.

Nos. 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, and 69 relate to number, rank, and official designation of officers in Pay Corps; conference agreement makes 3 colonels, 4 lieutenant-colonels, 20 majors, 25 captains, mounted, and retains the designation now provided by law.

No. 70 relates to promotion, and Senate recedes.

No. 71 relates only to number of section.

No. 72 is agreed to with an amendment, in line 8, page 32, by inserting after the word "shall" the words "as far as possible," and after the word "promotion" the words "according to seniority," and striking out the words "and appointment."

No. 73 refers to number of section.

Nos. 74, 75, 76, and 77 relate to number in each grade, and conference agreement leaves 1 colonel, 1 lieutenant-colonel, 4 majors, 14 captains, and 14 first lieutenants.

No. 78 increases first-class privates by 54. House recedes.

No. 79 relates to appointment in Signal Corps, and House agrees to same with an amendment which strikes out all relating to age and examination and changing the number of first lieutenants from 10 to 5 and second lieutenants from 10 to 5.

No. 80 relates only to number of section.

No. 81 is agreed to with an amendment protecting volunteer commissions. No. 82 relates to detail staff, and is agreed to by an amendment in line 8, page 34, after word "corps," by provisions which protect original vacancies created by this act from the detail system, and striking out the words "unless sooner retired" from line 13, so as to make the detail for four years.

Nos. 83 and 84 relate to examinations, and House recedes, as the bill now provides for detail to the staff without additional rank.

No. 85 relates to number of section.

No. 86 relates to number of section.

No. 87 relates to captains in the line. Senate recedes.

No. 88 is verbal only. House recedes.

No. 89 relates to lists of volunteer officers, and House recedes with an amendment in lines 20, 21, 22, and 23 by striking out words which are duplicated, and by striking out "officer," in line 4, page 40, and inserting the word "person," and by amending lines 9, 10, and 11, page 40, so as to let enlisted men of regulars or volunteers take examination for promotion to vacancies created by this bill after one year's service.

No. 90 relates to number of section.

No. 91 relates only to number of section.

No. 92 is verbal only, and House recedes.

No. 93 relates to discharge of soldiers after one year's service where a parent dies, and Senate recedes with an amendment requiring the soldier to apply for discharge.

No. 94 relates to number of section.

No. 95 is verbal only, and House recedes.

No. 96 relates only to number of section.

No. 97 relates to compulsory retirement, and House recedes.

No. 98 relates to placing two officers on retired list as brigadier-generals and one officer on the retired list as a major-general. House recedes from this agreement, making consent of Senate necessary.

No. 99 relates to number of section.

Nos. 100 and 101 are verbal only, and House recedes.

No. 102 relates to selecting four camps, and Senate recedes with an amendment which provides for four camps and provides that no contract for land shall be made until Congress approves the surveys and makes an appropriation therefor.

No. 103 relates only to number of section.

No. 104 inserts "and" after "officers," in line 11, page 44, and House recedes with an amendment striking out "shall" and inserting "may" in line 12.

No. 104 is verbal only, and House recedes.

No. 105 inserts "or enlisted men" in line 15, page 44, and House recedes with an amendment striking out of line 16, page 44, the words "during or

since the war with Spain" and inserting the words "subsequent to April 21, 1898."

No. 106 relates to pay of enlisted men from natives of islands and gives Secretary of War certain discretion as to pay and rations, and House recedes.

No. 107 relates to section on Porto Rican regiment and House recedes with an amendment by inserting after "island," line 17, page 45, the words "as far as practicable."

No. 108 relates to pay and allowances of Porto Rican regiment, and House recedes.

No. 109 gives the Secretary of War discretionary power in regard to pay, rations, and clothing allowances, and House recedes.

Nos. 110 and 111 relate only to numbers of sections.

No. 112 gives the President power to fix rations, and House recedes.

No. 113 grants power to those who served in the late war and in the insurrection in the Philippines to wear the distinctive badge of their military societies.

No. 114 relates to bounty for volunteer soldiers who may reenlist, whose term of service expires on the 1st day of July, 1901. The Senate recedes.

Mr. SPOONER. May I have the attention of the conferees for a moment?

Mr. HAWLEY. We are all listening.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to have some reason given for the reinsertion of this provision, which the Senate unanimously struck out of the bill. It is amendment No. 93:

Provided, That in the event of the enlistment of a soldier in the Army for the period required by law, and after the expiration of one year of service, should either of his parents die, leaving the other solely dependent upon the soldier for support, such soldier may be honorably discharged from the service of the United States upon due proof being made of such condition to the Secretary of War.

The conference report restored that proviso, amended by inserting the words "upon his own application," which is utterly inconsequential so far as the merit of the amendment is concerned. Unless there is some good reason for that provision—

Mr. COCKRELL. That is not stricken out.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, it was. It was stricken out by the Senate, and it is reinstated by the conference committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, I thought the Senator said it had been left out.

Mr. SPOONER. It was stricken out by the Senate, and reinstated by the conference committee, with the words added, "upon his own application." If there is a good reason for that, I have nothing to say about it.

Mr. PROCTOR. The purpose of it was just this: There have been cases where friends have applied for the discharge of a soldier (I have personally known of such cases) and the discharge has been granted, by favor, without the application of the soldier, and it was found when it came to him that he objected. He did not wish to leave the service.

Mr. SPOONER. I concede the propriety, if the proviso is to be in the bill, of the amendment made by the conferees, so that the soldier shall not be discharged without his own application; but what wisdom is there in the provision and what occasion is there for the provision itself?

Mr. HAWLEY. It speaks for itself; that is all.

Mr. SPOONER. It speaks badly for itself, in my judgment, if that is all the Senator has to say about it.

Mr. HAWLEY. What is the objection to it?

Mr. SPOONER. This is the objection to it—

Mr. HAWLEY. It was considered a very charitable and kindly provision.

Mr. SPOONER. I think it is a very uncharitable and unkindly provision.

Mr. HAWLEY. It does not do anything to the man without his consent.

Mr. SPOONER. It does a great deal to the man without his consent, if I understand it. To-day the President has discretion as to the discharge of a soldier. To-day, no matter how long a man may have served, as I understand, if the circumstances are such as to call, as a matter of humanity, for his discharge, it is competent for the President to discharge him. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. PROCTOR. That is right.

Mr. SPOONER. That is right. It is proposed now to limit, as I understand, that discretionary power of the President.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all.

Mr. SPOONER. Let us see whether or not it is:

Provided, That in the event of the enlistment of a soldier in the Army for the period required by law, and after the expiration of one year of service, should either of his parents die, leaving the other solely dependent upon the soldier for support, such soldier—

Not "shall," but—

may be honorably discharged from the service of the United States upon due proof being made of such condition to the Secretary of War.

Mr. SEWELL. It is discretionary with the Secretary of War. It does not go to the President.

Mr. SPOONER. No matter—

Mr. COCKRELL. It does not limit the power of the President.

Mr. SPOONER. It limits the power of the President in this respect, that he is given permission by this bill to discharge a soldier upon the happening of the contingency here indicated after he shall have served one year.

Mr. SEWELL. We did not construe it in that way.

Mr. SPOONER. It bears no other construction.

Mr. SEWELL. It simply enlarges the power of the Secretary of War. The President may discharge John Jones or John Smith after a day's service. He has that power. It does not interfere with him in any sense. Another power which the Secretary of War possesses is to discharge a man on the payment of a certain sum. This gives him the power without reference to the President.

Mr. SPOONER. I think not. This does not give it to the Secretary of War. It provides that the proof of the existence of the facts upon which the power to discharge is to be exercised shall be made to the Secretary of War. That is all.

Now, it seems to be admitted that under the law as it stands to-day the President has the power to discharge at any time a soldier when he thinks the circumstances are such as to make it proper or necessary that he should be discharged. When Congress, having control over the whole subject, enacts a law authorizing the President to grant a discharge for a particular reason and under special circumstances, that upon every rule of construction limits him to those cases.

Mr. HALE. *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*.

Mr. SPOONER. *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*.

Mr. McCOMAS. I have been listening to the Senator from Wisconsin. I would ask whether in his opinion the fourth article of the Articles of War are in any wise affected? Article 4 of the Articles of War, as found in the Revised Statutes, provides that a man shall not be discharged except by order of the President, the Secretary of War, the commanding officer of a department, or by sentence of a general court-martial. That power still remains, does it not?

Mr. COCKRELL. As a matter of course it does.

Mr. SPOONER. That is a question.

Mr. McCOMAS. Shall I read the section? It is very short.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. McCOMAS. I will not unless the Senator desires that it shall be read.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; read it.

Mr. McCOMAS. It is section 1342 of the Revised Statutes, article 4:

No enlisted man, duly sworn, shall be discharged from the service without a discharge in writing, signed by a field officer of the regiment to which he belonged, or by the commanding officer, when no field officer is present; and no discharge shall be given to any enlisted man before his term of service has expired, except by order of the President, Secretary of War, the commanding officer of a department, or by sentence of a general court-martial.

Mr. SPOONER. That, to my mind, does not throw any light upon the question. It is an act of Congress upon the subject of discharges. So is this. It is not directed to the authority of the Secretary of War at all. The only mention of the Secretary of War is as to the requirement that the proof shall be presented to him. This is a provision which apparently covers the whole subject of discharges.

Mr. McCOMAS. May I ask the Senator—

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to finish the sentence?

Mr. McCOMAS. What page is it?

Mr. SPOONER. Page 33. This is a provision which apparently covers the whole subject of discharges of enlisted men from the Regular Army, and so far as it is inconsistent, if it is inconsistent at all, with what the Senator has read, it repeals what the Senator has read. Moreover, being a permanent enactment, it may be regarded as a substitute, if adopted, for the provisions there mentioned.

Now, to-day the President has the power to discharge an enlisted man from the Army. This provides:

That in the event of the enlistment of a soldier in the Army for the period required by law, and after the expiration of one year of service, should either of his parents die, leaving the other solely dependent upon the soldier for support, such soldier may—

May—

be honorably discharged from the service of the United States upon due proof being made of such condition to the Secretary of War.

That is a limitation which we have a right to make upon the power of the President, and it leaves upon the statute book a later enactment than that which the Senator from Maryland has read, providing one case in which a soldier may be discharged, and I doubt very much whether it does not conflict with the provisions of the law read by the Senator.

Mr. HALE. Is it not—

Mr. SPOONER. There are two restrictions here, if the Senator from Maine will permit me. One is that the soldier must have remained in the service one year. I take it to be perfectly plain under this proposition that there is no authority to discharge a soldier except for wounds or disability until after he shall have served one year. I do not see the force or wisdom of any such restriction. If after one year the death of a father on whom the mother was solely dependent for support is a good reason for discharging a soldier from the service, why is it not a good reason if

the father died within a year after he has enlisted? And why limit it to the death of a parent, excluding total disability, which, for purposes of acquiring a livelihood, is little less than death?

There is another consideration, Mr. President; and I wish to take very little time. No right-minded soldier who has anyone dependent upon him for support would enlist in the Army of the United States with a provision in the statute that no matter what might happen at home, no matter what call circumstances might make upon him, it is beyond the power of the President to discharge him until after the expiration of a year.

Then why limit it to the death of a father or mother? Suppose a man having a wife and children dependent upon him goes into the service, and the wife is stricken with paralysis and helpless, and it is absolutely necessary to the care of his children that he should be at home to look after them. If the circumstances are such that a generous-minded or just-minded President would discharge him, he ought not to be tied up in the exercise of that power by any statute provision. Suppose the wife died instead of the father or mother, leaving a flock of little children without relatives to be scattered in the absence of the father among the poor-houses. Ought not that to be taken into consideration?

Mr. HAWLEY. I should like to make an interesting explanation there. No married men are enlisted.

Mr. SPOONER. They marry after they are enlisted sometimes.

Mr. HAWLEY. That we can not very well help.

Mr. SPOONER. They marry after they are enlisted. Of course the Army regulations are not as strict as this. It does not seem to me that this one-year limitation should be put upon the President. We never had any trouble about it. If the President has the discretion, he will exercise it wisely.

I agree entirely that if the provision is left in there should be an application of the soldier. I am perfectly willing that there shall be incorporated a provision that no soldier shall be discharged except upon his own application. I have had to send hundreds of letters informing soldiers of the rule of the Department on that subject.

I do not like this provision, and I see no reason and hear no reason given for it. The Senate struck it out unanimously, and I think the committee of conference ought to have left it out.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, this amendment came to the Senate from the House, and the Senate disagreed to it. In conference the Senate conferees had to yield because other conferees had rights as well as Senators.

The Senator from Wisconsin has mistaken the whole scope and object of this provision, and has misinterpreted it. It is not a limitation upon the right and power of the President, or the Secretary of War, or the commanding general of the department in any shape, manner, or form. It gives to a soldier in a certain contingency a right, and that is all it does.

Mr. TELLER. It says he "may be honorably discharged."

Mr. COCKRELL. That is all it does. It does not limit the President. It does not restrict him. It does not weaken the power of the President to discharge for any cause he deems proper, the power of the Secretary of War to discharge for any cause he sees proper, or the power of the commanding general of the department, but it says in a certain event the soldier upon his own application may be discharged, and that event is one that during the war with Spain was frequently used in securing the discharge of soldiers—a dependent widowed mother, or something of that kind. I think I had at least half a dozen soldiers discharged, and it was known they were not to be sent to Cuba because they had widowed dependent mothers. This simply gives the right to a soldier after a certain length of time upon his own application to be discharged. The President can discharge them before that time for any cause he deems proper; the Secretary of War can discharge them for any cause he deems proper, and the commanding general can discharge them.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Can not a soldier now ask to be discharged on account of a misfortune of that sort?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; he can ask to be discharged.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then how does this enlarge his privileges or rights?

Mr. COCKRELL. This gives him the right to be discharged in that event.

Mr. SPOONER. It does not.

Mr. COCKRELL. He has not a right to be discharged now; he has a right to apply.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The President can not discharge him now?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly the President can discharge him.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This leaves it altogether in the hands of the President?

Mr. COCKRELL. This gives him a right to ask to be discharged.

Mr. SPOONER. It is not needed to enable him to "ask."

Mr. COCKRELL. To be discharged upon his own application.

Mr. BURROWS. He "may be" discharged.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Missouri would be quite right if it provided that in the given case, upon making due proof to the Secretary of War, the soldier should be entitled to be discharged. But that is not provided here, and whether it is a restriction upon the power of the President or not is purely a question of law.

I have obtained discharges, just as the Senator says he has; and there is no doubt that to-day the President has the power to discharge in such a case. My trouble is, and it is not technical (and I do not want to take an unnecessary moment of the Senate's time), that after the adoption of this proposition he will not have the power which he has now. Let me read it again. It is general in its language. It applies to enlisted soldiers generally. It is provided in this bill:

In the event of the enlistment of a soldier in the Army for the period required by law, and after the expiration of one year of service, should either of his parents die leaving the other solely dependent upon the soldier for support, such soldier may be honorably discharged.

He can now, upon his own application, be discharged without having served a year, but I take it that no one will deny that if this is adopted he must have served a year before he can be discharged. If that is not a restriction upon the power of the President, I do not know what language would constitute a restriction.

Moreover, there may be a restriction in a broader sense than that, for where you provide that the President may discharge a soldier in a particular event, upon the settled rules of statutory construction you exclude him except in that event. My own opinion when this matter was before the Senate in the first place—and the Senate seemed to so think (I believe the Senator from Colorado made the motion to strike it out)—was that the President ought to be left with discretion to discharge a soldier whether he had served a year or a month if the circumstances were such, and were made properly to appear to him to be such, that common humanity required that he should be discharged.

I do not think this provision ought to be in the law.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I never believed in this provision at all. I did not favor it, and would be glad to have had it stricken out. It, however, never occurred to me that it could be interpreted as limiting the power of the President. All the force that I think it has is a statutory indication of a reason which the soldier may give in his application for the discharge. It gives him a special reason which he may use.

Mr. SPOONER. If he ought to be discharged on the death of his father or mother after a year, should he not be discharged in the event of the death occurring before the expiration of a year?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do not consider that this restricts that in the least. I do not understand it in that way.

Mr. SPOONER. What does it mean, then, when it says "that in the event of the enlistment of a soldier in the Army for the period required by law, and after the expiration of one year of service," etc.?

Mr. PROCTOR. The Secretary of War or the commanding general of the department may discharge a soldier at any time and for any purpose that he chooses.

Mr. SPOONER. That begs the question.

Mr. PROCTOR. This indicates to the soldier a special reason which he may give for asking to be discharged. I think that is all the force of it, although it is apparently useless and I did not favor it originally.

Mr. SPOONER. Then this is only intended as a guide to the soldier as to the circumstances under which he may be discharged?

Mr. PROCTOR. I think that is all the force of it.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Senate struck this provision out, I think I can say, because it was supposed to be a limitation upon the power of the President, and it is a limitation. I do not know whether it was intended as such or not, but it certainly is a limitation by any canon of construction known to the profession.

Now, the President can do everything that is provided here, and he can do it in an hour after the soldier enlists, if he sees fit. When this passes he will have to wait a year to do it; that is certain; and then he need not do it. It is not a case where you provide that he shall do it. He may do it. He may do that now. It is simply, Mr. President, putting into the statute a provision that may be construed, and undoubtedly will be construed, to limit the discharge to just such cases as this, and to take away the general power of the President to discharge, a power that has never been abused that I know of. There can be no reason given on the face of the earth why the provision should be in the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think one is given by the War Department. It will relieve them considerably.

Mr. KENNEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question.

Mr. TELLER. It may relieve them, because they may say, "Now, you do not come within the provision; we are bound by a statute." The Senate did not intend to limit the President in the slightest degree. We intended to leave him with the authority to dismiss any soldier from the Army whenever a case was made that in his judgment justified it. Now the Department may say, "We will not be required to write so many letters, because we can say here is a rule that the statute has made for us, and your case does not fall within the rule." If that is what we want to do—

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. TELLER. I will in a moment. If that is what we want to do, this will do it. Now I will hear what the Senator from Delaware has to say.

Mr. KENNEY. I wish to ask the Senator whether he contends that that provision limits the power of the President of the United States to grant discharges?

Mr. TELLER. Well, I said it as plainly as my English will admit.

Mr. KENNEY. Then I will ask him the further question whether or not the Secretary of War can now, under the present law, grant a discharge without that provision?

Mr. TELLER. This will be the law of the Department, no matter what the Secretary can do to-day, as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin. It is the rule. You have now laid down a rule. He must come within that rule. It is possible, of course, that the soldier can be discharged if he has lost a leg, or something of that kind. A wound or a disability of course discharges him, and that would not affect this.

Mr. President, if the provision does not limit his power it certainly does not enlarge it. Does anybody pretend to say that the President has not the power to do all this now? If the words had been "the soldier shall, upon his application, be discharged," that would be a different thing; but that is not the language. It is here for no good reason that can be given in the world, and I think, the Senate having struck it out by a unanimous vote, it ought to be left out.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I understand that this bill was drawn up by the War Department in a large measure and submitted to Congress and that it contains the views of the Secretary of War and those in authority. From my own experience in the matter of getting discharges I think it is a very rare instance where anybody ever goes to the President to get a discharge. You make your application to the Adjutant-General or to the Secretary of War.

Mr. TELLER. Of course; that is the custom.

Mr. TILLMAN. And if he turns the case down, that ends it, for nobody would think of appealing from the Secretary of War to the President, unless it was in some remarkable case. But my judgment is that the bill intends to prevent any man from getting out of the Army within one year under any conditions, even in an extraordinary case, where the parents of the soldier have died and the conditions are such as to appeal to humanity and to demand his discharge; that the War Department intend that it shall be a limitation on discharges for any cause, because they do not intend to give them, and in a case which would appeal to the humanity of men this is to be used as an excuse for turning down the application, because they can say the statute so declares.

Mr. BURROWS. This provision was put on in the House.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Vermont suspend one moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated?

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 727) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary.

Mr. HALE. Let the bill be informally laid aside.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me a moment, in reply to the Senator from South Carolina, I will say that this amendment was put in on the floor of the House.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for further consideration of the conference report of the Army reorganization bill.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from Vermont will permit me, the fact that the provision was put on in the House does not indicate that it originated in the House. It may have come from the War Department and been suggested to the member who moved

it in the House. That fact does not change the complexion of the bill as a measure that meets the approval of the War Department.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that he take up this conference report again to-morrow morning.

Mr. HAWLEY. I shall call the attention of the Senate to it immediately after the morning business to-morrow.

Mr. TELLER. That being the case, I do not believe I will discuss the Army bill on the ship-subsidy bill. So I will quit.

PROMOTION OF COMMERCE AND INCREASE OF TRADE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 727) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, last night I proposed certain amendments to the bill and gave notice that I intended to offer certain other amendments. I move to amend the bill on page 8.

Mr. FRYE. Of the last print?

Mr. ALDRICH. On page 8 of the former print. It is on page 7 of the latest print. On page 7, line 20, I move to strike out all after the word "contract" down to and including line 8, on page 8, and to insert what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island offers an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 20, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "contract" down to and including line 8, on page 8, and to insert:

Prove to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that he or they (the said citizen or citizens) has or have already contracted with responsible parties for the building, within a reasonable period of time, not exceeding three years, in the United States, of a new vessel or vessels, and that the construction of the said vessel or vessels has already been begun, conditioned that the contract or contracts so to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide for the payment to the owner or owners of the new vessel or vessels so to be built, for a period of fifteen years from the date of the completion and registry of such vessel or vessels, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the amendment be read in connection with the text.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the section may be read as proposed to be amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The section will be read as it would stand if amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

Page 7, line 13:

"(F) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby further authorized and directed to contract with any citizen or citizens of the United States (including as such citizens corporations created under the laws of the United States or any of the States thereof) who shall apply to said Secretary within five years next after the passage of this act for a contract such as is in this act provided, and shall, on applying for such contract, prove to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that he or they (the said citizen or citizens) has or have already contracted with responsible parties for the building, within a reasonable period of time, not exceeding three years, in the United States, of a new vessel or vessels, and that the construction of the said vessel or vessels has already been begun, conditioned that the contract or contracts so to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide for the payment to the owner or owners of the new vessel or vessels so to be built, for a period of fifteen years from the date of the completion and registry of such vessel or vessels, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the," etc.

Mr. TURLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Tennessee will pardon me a moment, I desire to ask in reference to the last amendment if the Senator does not desire to have it printed. We would like to see it in print.

Mr. ALDRICH. I desire to have it printed. The Senator from Tennessee is entitled to the floor. I am willing to explain it, but I will defer the explanation until after the Senator has completed his remarks. I have another amendment to offer. Perhaps I had better wait and defer that also.

Mr. TURLEY. If you want to offer the amendment now, I will wait. Let it be offered.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let it be offered and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH. In section 3 of the bill, at the bottom of the ninth page of the new print, I move to strike out the word "twenty," in the twenty-fifth line, and insert "fifteen."

Mr. SPOONER. That is to limit the life of the contract?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is to limit the life of the contract.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. TURLEY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly this bill. I do so with some diffidence, because it is a character of subject with which I have had very little acquaintance. I have listened to much of the discussion in the Senate, and I have thought a good deal over it. I desire now to present in as brief a way as I can the points in it which seem to me objectionable, and especially which have given me trouble.

It is a bill under which, at least by the admission of all parties, \$180,000,000 are to be taken out of the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of certain particular interests, the interests of the shipowners and the shipbuilders. It is true, if one of the pending amendments is adopted, that amount may be reduced in a very small degree, but, on the contrary, \$180,000,000 does not include the appropriations which are made to the deep-sea fishery and to the seamen engaged therein.

I am reminded, in looking over some of the documents, of a remark made by ex-Senator Edmunds in discussing one of these subsidy measures, in which he announced that he would never vote to take one dollar out of the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of a private industry or a private enterprise, or for any such purpose as is disclosed in this bill, unless the very strongest reasons were given for it. It seems to me, Mr. President, before we embark upon this enterprise, the greatest bounty that this Government could ever be asked to give to any interest, that the most cogent and convincing reasons, such as would remove every doubt, should be given for the passage of the measure.

Now, in whose interest is this bounty to be given? The shipowners and the shipbuilders. It is well for us to stop and inquire, in the first instance, whether these interests have heretofore been favored by the Government; whether they are now and have been for years receiving the greatest favors from the Government and have been protected and fostered by it in every way.

Mr. President, already they have in their favor exceptions in the tariff law which admit free of duty all materials used in the construction of ships for foreign trade, and this has existed now for some sixteen or eighteen years. In addition to this they have the absolute monopoly of the coastwise trade of the United States. No foreign vessel can engage in that enterprise.

It is well, Mr. President, to look for a moment at what the coastwise trade means. I read now from the report of Mr. O. P. Austin, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, in a pamphlet just issued and distributed among us, entitled *The Shipping Industry of the United States and Its Relation to the Foreign Trade*. That document shows that—

The frontier of the United States measures 10,800 miles in length, 5,200 miles of which is coast line, fronting on the oceans and the Gulf of Mexico. Besides this there is a lake and river coast of 2,100 miles in length. The greater part of this water frontage of 7,900 miles is deep enough to admit of shipbuilding in some one or more of its several branches.

I have heard nowhere any comparison of what this coastwise trade amounts to as compared with our foreign trade. If we include the Great Lakes, I should say it far exceeded our foreign trade, for, as I understand, there are points on these Great Lakes before which more tonnage of freight passes than before any other points on the habitable globe. All this benefit of the absolute monopoly of this immense trade is already secured to this enterprise, which is now again knocking at the doors of the United States Treasury and demanding \$180,000,000 more.

Let us go a little further, Mr. President. Under our law every naval vessel of the United States has to be built in one of these favorite yards, and these subsidies are to be paid out of the taxes levied upon the people of the United States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. TURLEY. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator explain what the coastwise and lake trade has to do with the foreign trade?

Mr. TURLEY. I was not saying that it had anything especially to do with the foreign trade.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does not the Senator understand that the object of this bill is to give to the foreign trade a portion of the protection and benefits which has heretofore been given to the coastwise and lake trade?

Mr. TURLEY. I understand the object of this bill, if the Senator wants to know, is to take \$180,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States and put it into the pockets of certain gentlemen who own ships and build ships. That is the object of the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; but the Senator was proceeding to say something about the coastwise trade and the lake trade, and the protection which it had been afforded. I want to ask the Senator what the coastwise and lake trade has to do with the foreign trade, which this bill applies to?

Mr. TURLEY. I think the Senator did not follow me.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did.

Mr. TURLEY. Then I must have been confused in my statement. I was addressing myself to these points, Mr. President: If a gentleman comes to me and seeks a bounty of me, and I had on the previous day made him a very large contribution, I would say to him that I thought he ought to wait a while before he asked for more.

Now, I say that these shipbuilders and shipowners are in this condition. They have already received from the United States through our navigation and shipping laws the absolute monopoly of the most lucrative trade, all of which must necessarily fall more or less as a burden upon the citizens of the United States. I say

that is a favored class, a highly favored class, a class that is already reaping riches and growing fat on this monopoly which has been granted to them, and it comes with ill grace from it to come here and say, "This is not enough; we want \$180,000,000 more."

As I said, I was making no argument with reference to the coastwise trade being connected with the foreign trade. It has, though, a connection that I am not going into at this time; but I say when a man or an interest or an enterprise has received the immense favor this enterprise has received from the Government of the United States it is not entitled now to ask for this large additional gift.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. TURLEY. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I desire to ask the Senator whether or not the shipping interest engaged in the foreign trade has received any part of the benefit and protection that has been afforded to the coastwise and lake trade? That is the question I ask, and one as to which I insist on an answer.

Mr. TURLEY. I will answer the Senator's question as well as I can. I am not very well posted on these shipyards, but I understand that in a good many places around the coast of the United States—on the Great Lakes, in Maine, in California, and on the Western coast—there are shipyards, and that those shipyards turn out ships for the coasting trade, as I think I will show a little further on, and also for the foreign trade.

In other words, as I understand—I may be wholly mistaken about it—there is not a shipyard that builds a ship, especially for the foreign trade, that will refuse to build ships for the coastwise trade. The same individuals own the shipyards and are interested in this enterprise. This subsidy is going to individuals; it is not going to ships. Ships are only inanimate objects. This subsidy is going into some man's pocket; that is where it is going. It is going into the pockets of the men who own ships and own shipyards; who own the ships running in the coastwise trade as well as in the foreign trade, and the shipyards building ships for the coastwise as well as the foreign trade. The individuals who own these shipyards have received the benefit of this monopoly for years and years, and now they say that "it is not enough; we want more"—\$180,000,000 more at this present moment. What it will be hereafter, the good Lord only knows.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not want to take too much of the Senator's time—

Mr. TURLEY. I will yield to the Senator's interruption with pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. TURLEY. I have plenty of time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have studied this question with some care, and I have listened to the Senator's argument with very great respect, but when I hear an argument advanced here either for or against the bill that is not only not sound, but as disingenuous as this, I feel it my duty to call attention to it.

I want to ask this question again, Whether the Senator can point out any shipping industry engaged in the foreign trade that has received any benefit whatever from the Government?

In that connection I should like to ask the Senator another question. I ask whether the Senator thinks that the protection afforded to the lake and coastwise trade has been beneficial to the country? I will stop and wait for an answer to that question.

Mr. TURLEY. I will give the Senator an answer right now; and fortunately I have the paper right here.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator think it has been beneficial in respect of the protection afforded to the coastwise and lake trade?

Mr. TURLEY. I am not on that subject now.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator was discussing it, and that was the reason I asked the question.

Mr. TURLEY. If the Senator wants a frank answer, I say if the coastwise trade had been left open to competition and every man had a right to sail a ship in it who was in peace, amity, and friendship toward this country, I think we would not have been any worse off. That is my honest belief, although I may be mistaken.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, if the Senator will pardon me a remark right there, I will not trouble him further. I understand the Senator to say that he is in favor of taking from our coastwise and lake trade the protection that is now afforded to that trade. With that admission from the Senator I have no further questions to ask him.

Mr. TURLEY. I am glad I have at last satisfied the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator has.

Mr. TURLEY. I will not be here very long, but if during my brief term of service such a bill should be brought in I would be very glad to vote for it. I am glad this thing has come up, because I can speak of it just as well here as anywhere else.

The Senator, as I understand, asks the question whether I can point out any vessels engaged in the foreign commerce of the

United States that have received any benefits from the United States; or did I understand him to confine his question with reference to the coastwise trade?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No, sir; my question was with reference to the foreign trade.

Mr. TURLEY. There are such vessels that run in the foreign trade, and they are vessels which compose a large part of the International Navigation Line, as I understand, two of which were built in Europe and two in the United States. We have been paying out in mail pay—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh!

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is a bounty.

Mr. TURLEY. I will show that there is some subsidy here. If there is not, some vessels in the foreign trade are getting very wonderfully cheated, that is all.

I have a statement here, giving the figures and showing the amounts paid. These figures come from the report of the Commissioner of Navigation, and they show the amount and weight of the mail. I also have here some papers sent out by the Reform Club of New York, and I suppose they are accurate.

It seems that we sent by the American or International Line, two of whose vessels were built in Europe and two in the United States, as I have said, 72,611,000 grams of letters, and then 752,728,773 grams of printed matter; and we paid for that \$647,278.40. We sent by the Cunard Line 118,287,735 grams of letters—that is the high-priced postage—as against 72,611,000 grams by the American Line; and we also sent by the Cunard Line 731,330,378 grams of printed matter, making a total of 849,618,113 grams over the Cunard Line (as against 825,339,773 by the International Line) for just \$184,721.04.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will ask the Senator a question there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If these figures have any pertinency at all they are only given to show that the Senator is in favor of withdrawing the contract from the American Line and placing the contract with a foreign line. Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. TURLEY. Undoubtedly. If the Senator wants my position, I would say, send these mails, as Great Britain and other countries do, by the ship that would carry them cheapest. I am frank about that, if that is any satisfaction to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That admission is very satisfactory.

Mr. TURLEY. I was raised up in that doctrine, and expect to die in it.

But now, coming back to the other point, as to whether any of these foreign vessels engaged in foreign commerce have been getting anything from the Treasury of the United States for which they have not given due return, I have shown that we pay over \$647,278 to the American Line for carrying a less amount of mail of the same kind, while we pay to the Cunard Line \$184,721 for carrying a greater amount of mail of the same kind. If these payments are based on service, how in the world is it? It looks to me as if the difference between this \$184,000 and \$647,000 is a pure gratuity, a bounty in disguise to this American Line.

I ask Senators upon what principle of justice, upon what principle of public policy is it? How is the United States benefited by taking from the taxpayers and the Treasury of the United States nearly \$500,000 and paying to this American Line more than they ought to receive for the services they render? And yet these are the figures; and that is the result, and that is the bounty that this American Line has been receiving. Yet it is not enough. They want something like \$1,200,000, and say they can not live and be comfortable without it. That is the history of this matter.

Mr. President, I want to come briefly, as I said, to the reasons for this bill. I have shown that the interests in whose behalf it is being urged are already fully protected and fostered by the Government beyond almost any other interest in the country.

I omitted to state that, in addition to these other benefits which they receive, all our war vessels must be built in American shipyards. Other governments do not adopt that policy. In other words, our taxpayers, if there is a difference in the cost of these ships between our own country and Europe, are forced to pay a higher price for the benefit of the very men who are now here asking for \$180,000,000 more.

But let me pass over that and come to another feature of this bill, to which I want briefly to call attention, and that is the constitutional feature. I am not going into any long constitutional argument on this bill. I am going to read from what ex-Senator Edmunds said. It has been read to the Senate before, but I think it will bear repetition. I read from the speech of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], made on this bill some weeks ago, at page 51, where he quotes from ex-Senator Edmunds, and I want to apply that a little. Ex-Senator Edmunds says:

The Constitution of the United States as it now stands is designed to prevent Congress as well as the States from enacting any class legislation whatever. Equal rights and equal opportunities to engage in any business or

enterprise, and to receive equal or corresponding benefits from public expenditures, are among the fundamental principles embodied in that instrument. Congress may raise and support armies and navies, and do whatever is fairly incidental to those ends, and thus may provide for inducing the building of ships which may be taken and used in the national defense. It may possibly grant bounties on the exportation of all the products of the country as a means of improving commercial relations with other countries. But if it discriminates by granting bounties on the exportation of particular classes of products it does at once establish a governmental difference in favor of those particular classes and against all other products capable of and designed for similar exportation. It is clear to me, therefore, that a bounty on the exportation of woolen goods or wheat, for instance, while the exportation of cotton goods or corn was left unaided, would be in violation of the Constitution. I think, then, that a law granting a bounty on agricultural products alone, as has been suggested, could not be upheld, just as a bounty on the exportation of manufactured products alone could not be upheld.

Mr. President, as I understand this matter, this argument of ex-Senator Edmunds was made in answer to a demand of certain agricultural interests upon the committee of twenty-five, who framed this bill, to have a bounty put on the actual amount of agricultural products shipped. The sum and substance of this argument and of this provision, as I understand it, is this: That we can not put a bounty on any class or on one particular class of agricultural products, because it would be class legislation; that you can not give wheat a bounty unless you give a bounty to corn and to cotton and to all the other agricultural products. It equally follows that when you come to manufactures, when you come to all these enterprises which turn the products of the earth into manufactured goods, the same rule would apply.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator whether ex-Senator Edmunds said exactly what the Senator now states, that we can not give a bounty, or simply spoke of an export bounty?

Mr. TURLEY. The language which he used was in reference to the application made to have this particular bounty upon agricultural products that went abroad in ships, and I suppose it was in reference to exports.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will pardon me.

Mr. TURLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator may think that the things stand in the same way, but I do not believe that the former Senator from Vermont thought so—that is, the Senator, in his citation of Mr. Edmunds in his argument, speaks of the doctrine which prohibits an export duty upon a particular product and a bounty on that product as identical. I merely wish, without entering into any argument at this time, to suggest to the Senator my belief that the author of the argument he has quoted regarded them as standing on very different principles.

Mr. TURLEY. I understand those remarks as being made with reference to the bounty.

Mr. SPOONER. Read them again.

Mr. BERRY. It was in reference to the bounty.

Mr. TURLEY. The language of Mr. Edmunds will be found on page 51 of the speech of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE].

Mr. HOAR. A bounty on exports is not a bounty on products.

Mr. TURLEY. This is the opinion that ex-Senator Edmunds, as I understand, gave the committee as a reason why they should not listen to the application of the agriculturists, who asked, as I understand, that the bounty that was given should be so adjusted as to be measured by the actual amount of agricultural products that went abroad in these ships. That is what he was arguing; that is his language, and he did not make any such distinction. I will read again what he said. He uses this language:

It is clear to me, therefore, that a bounty on the exportation of woolen goods or wheat, for instance, while the exportation of cotton goods or corn was left unaided, would be in violation of the Constitution. I think, then, that a law granting a bounty on agricultural products alone, as has been suggested, could not be upheld, just as a bounty on the exportation of manufactured products alone could not be upheld.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Allow me to suggest to the Senator, in that same connection, that Senator Edmunds mentioned the bounty on sugar.

Mr. TURLEY. He did.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. And he held that was unconstitutional and that it was in no sense a bounty on exports.

Mr. TURLEY. I will read further what ex-Senator Edmunds says:

If a bounty on exports is to be granted, it must apply to all exports. If such a course of legislation can be maintained at all, it must be on the ground that it is impartial and universal. The instance in our history of the fisheries bounty stood on the principle and policy of providing seamen for national defense. And the sugar bounty of a few years ago, if it could have been held valid at all, which is extremely doubtful, must have been upheld on the ground of the special and peculiar circumstances attending that subject.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me—if I am not interfering with him too much—that is exactly the point.

Mr. TURLEY. The Senator is not interfering with me at all.

Mr. HOAR. I do not want to enter into a constitutional debate in the midst of the Senator's very interesting and clear statement of his views, but it seems to me that there is a very wide distinction between an affirmation that you can not under the Constitution give a bounty to any particular export which is not extended to all exports alike, and a statement that you can not, under particular

and special circumstances for special and peculiar public advantages, give a bounty on products.

We have given a bounty for many years, and did it in the beginning of the operation of the Constitution, on the fisheries, on the ground largely—not wholly, by any means, but conceding that fact for the sake of the argument—not wholly, but it was largely on the ground of encouraging a nursery for seamen; in other words, an advantage to one of the great constitutional objects committed to the care of Congress was in that way promoted; and the former Senator from Vermont says that while he doubts about the sugar bounty, it may be defended and vindicated on the same ground of being a peculiar promoting of the advantage of some object which is under the fostering care of Congress.

As I understand, the friends of this subsidy put it precisely on that ground. It, of course, is not a bounty on exports; but it promotes a certain public object, to wit, commerce, by promoting the creation of certain instruments of commerce at home, under which the commerce of the United States, especially that great portion of it called the foreign carrying trade, is to be built up and promoted, and incidentally, and at the same time with absolute certainty, the strength and safety of the country in time of war, and also a direct object of the care of Congress is to be promoted.

Therefore I suggest to the Senator that in quoting that great authority against bounties on exports the Senator does not in the least touch the argument on which the friends of the policy of this subsidy bill defend it.

Mr. TURLEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts interrupted me, for he always throws light on every question. If I understand him, he seems to hold that Congress has power, under proper circumstances, to grant bounties to almost any industry in the United States.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, as he put that question—I ought not to be led into interrupting him so much—but as the Senator put the question—

Mr. TURLEY. It is not at all an interruption.

Mr. HOAR. I have no doubt, taking a simple illustration, that, instead of establishing a national armory at Springfield or at Rock Island, Congress might constitutionally and with great propriety have given a bounty on the manufacture of muskets or cannon or projectiles or explosives. In point of fact, the existence of private armories, which were taken possession of by the Government, whose employees went into the employ of the Government in 1861 and shortly thereafter, was a great strength and defense to the country in that time of war. Now, if the Government may do that as one means of insuring the public safety in war, it may do it as a means, in its discretion, of promoting national commerce by giving like subsidies to the builders of steamships.

Mr. TURLEY. Of course I catch the proposition which the Senator has so clearly stated, but I want to read again a few lines from the beginning of what ex-Senator Edmunds says. It may be that he had exports and all of that in his mind, but his language goes further. Now mark. He says:

The Constitution of the United States as it now stands is designed to prevent Congress as well as the States from enacting any class legislation whatever. Equal rights and equal opportunities to engage in any business or enterprise, and to receive equal or corresponding benefits from public expenditures, are among the fundamental principles embodied in that instrument.

Let me suggest another idea. If ex-Senator Edmunds is right in that this doctrine of class legislation and unequal laws would prevent a bounty on exports, why does it not do it on all other matters? For instance, exactly the same argument and the same reason on which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] says a bounty could be granted to an armory or a manufacturing establishment intended to make arms would justify Congress in giving a bounty on exports of those products and products of the kind which could be used in the national defense in order to stimulate production and increase the amount of such products.

Now, let me state two propositions and see where the difference is between them in principle. Suppose Congress passes a bill for the Colt establishment in Connecticut, which is engaged in the manufacture of arms. The United States needs arms when war comes, and therefore a bounty of so many thousands of dollars a year is granted out of the Treasury to the Colt manufactory; or, take another case. Suppose a law is passed by Congress reciting these facts—of course I am not putting it in exact legislative language—that the United States needs clothing with which to clothe its soldiers in time of war just as much as it does arms to enable them to fight. A soldier without clothes would be as useless as one without arms.

Let us go back to years ago, and take the cotton industry. It is an infantile industry, and it needs stimulation. It produces that which is absolutely necessary to sustain the Government in time of war, as well as to clothe its armies in time of peace. Congress, therefore, passes a law that it will stimulate this industry to find a market for its product in foreign countries and encourage our planters here to raise a larger supply, so that, in case of an emer-

gency of war, we will have a supply of clothing on hand; therefore a bounty of 5 cents a pound is granted on every pound of cotton exported out of the United States.

Mr. BACON. Coal.

Mr. TURLEY. Yes. Take horses. We have a large body of cavalry in our Army, and the war in South Africa has taught us that the wars of the future will be fought largely by mounted infantry, all of whom need horses, and Congress passes a law granting bounties in aid of the horse industry. It may do it by giving direct to the man who raises a horse so much for every colt born, or in order to stimulate the industry it may do it indirectly by saying that for every horse exported to a foreign country we will pay so much bounty, because that will increase the production at home, and when war breaks out we will have a high grade of horses here with which to supply our needs.

Where is the difference? Where does this argument end? There is scarcely an article produced in the United States which can not come to the door of the Treasury of the United States and demand a bounty upon the same argument and the same principle. Take coal and iron, out of which the steel is made which clothes our battle ships and makes them engines of destruction against our enemy. Let either one of those industries say "We need it, because when war comes you need the product; give us a bounty to stimulate this industry."

So with wheat and corn. Can the soldier march and fight, can the sailor float over the seas without food? Suppose a bill is offered granting so much export bounty or so much domestic bounty upon every bushel of wheat or corn grown in this country, so that we may have overflowing granaries to meet our wants when war strikes us. There is no end to this argument. There is not a thing under the sun, I say, within this land of ours that can not as logically demand a bounty, because when war comes its demands reach out and require almost everything that is made or grown.

Now, the principle is not changed because the bounty is granted at the point where it is exported. It can just as well be granted there as anywhere else, if Congress has the power. It is for Congress to judge of the manner and method in which the bounty shall be administered. It is for it to determine the ways and the means. No court or other power, if Congress has the constitutional right to give this bounty, can say, "You shall not put it on because it is here at the line of territory where the article goes out of the United States, but you may put it on within the limits of the United States."

That is a matter within the discretion of Congress, if the power exists. Hence I say that if what ex-Senator Edmunds says is true, if the Constitution of the United States and the principles of our Government are designed to prevent Congress, as well as the State, from enacting class legislation and giving benefits to the few over the many, then this bounty system is stamped all over with unconstitutionality.

Mr. President, let me progress a step further and apply it to this bill. I have heard the argument made, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] says the fisheries bounty was sustained, amongst other reasons, on the ground that it afforded seamen and gave us strength in time of war. The advocates of this bill have told us, and I think Senator Edmunds—now I do not intend to do any injustice, because I have not got that before me—rather sustains the bill itself on this ground.

Mr. BACON. Certainly he does.

Mr. TURLEY. That it is a war measure in one sense of the word; that it gives us auxiliary ships in time of war. If all these other bounties that I have been describing can be granted, I suppose this can be, because we can not inquire into the motives of Congress; but with all due deference to those who support this bill, let me show the hypocrisy of this claim.

I am told, and I find it laid down by many writers, that an auxiliary ship to a navy must be a fast ship; that with the armed vessels of the navy of the world making 23 and 24 knots, an auxiliary ship running 15 or 16 or 17 knots would just be an invitation to them to come and prey upon it. They could neither fight nor run away. What does this bill do? Under this bill the United States can add only about three more 21-knot ships to those it now has. There can only be, by the provisions of the bill, \$2,000,000 a year paid to ships running over 20 knots an hour. The International American Company, with its two foreign ships which have been naturalized—

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. TURLEY. Certainly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I understood that by the amendment offered yesterday no ship secured a bounty for over 18 knots, and all these ships would be cut out entirely.

Mr. BERRY. It was not agreed to, I think.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to say to the Senator that I understand such an amendment was introduced and adopted yesterday.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It was adopted?

Mr. SPOONER. It was not adopted.

Mr. CLAY. I think it was. The bill will show.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It was reported by the committee and agreed to.

Mr. TURLEY. I do not know how that is. The bill will show when it is printed. But undoubtedly there was a provision in this bill (whether it was an amendment or came in in the original bill from the committee of twenty-five or from the Committee on Commerce I do not know) that out of the \$9,000,000 only \$2,000,000 annually should go to ships that ran as fast as 20 knots.

Mr. SPOONER. The amendment was not adopted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The amendment has been offered and is pending.

Mr. TURLEY. The International Company has four ships which, I am told—I have not worked out the figures, but they have been announced on the floor, and not contradicted—will absorb \$1,200,000 of the two million. How many ships are you going to build out of the remaining \$800,000 a year? So you have a bill here that you are urging us to pass, which means raiding the Treasury to the amount of a hundred and eighty million dollars, and you say it must be done because the Navy needs auxiliary ships; and when you come to examine this hypocritical argument you find that under the most favorable aspects of the bill you could add but about three 21-knot ships to the Navy. I pass on from that point, and take up other points of the bill.

Mr. President, all the arguments in favor of this bill begin with a most magnificent description of the great advance we have made in manufactures and commerce, and especially foreign commerce, in the past twenty or thirty years. I can not express it one-half so eloquently as it was expressed by the able Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW]. I wish to read his description of the happy condition in which we find ourselves, the prosperous condition in which we find ourselves, the condition of wonderful advancement in which we find ourselves when this demand is made upon the Treasury. He says:

From 5,000,000 of population in 1800 we are 77,000,000 in 1900. From having little rank in agriculture and none whatever in manufactures, our productions now enable this enormous population to live far better than did our forefathers one hundred years ago, and the surplus of our farms and factories is entering the markets and succeeding in competition all over the world. For a hundred years the debtor nation, we enter upon the twentieth century a banker for all the governments of Europe. We have changed the continent which was a wilderness beyond the fringe of settlements on the Atlantic coast to great cities, thriving villages, prosperous farms, and active industries on the plains and in the mountains from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Circle. Our railway lines, covering the country with a network of steel, in connection with transportation facilities on the inland lakes, rivers, and canals, have given to us an internal commerce greater than that of all the interchanges of all the nations of the earth by rail and water. In length of lines we number nearly one-half the mileage of the railways of the world.

When I read that magnificent description of our progress, the idea suggests itself to me that we have done all this without giving any such subsidy as the one which is now demanded in behalf of these shipowners. If the course we have pursued up to this day has brought to us this unexampled prosperity, has made our exports now even greater than those of our rival, Great Britain, why should this subsidy be demanded under the pretense of increasing them?

Mr. President, there is another question in connection with this matter. How long is this subsidy to last? How long is it to continue? As I go a little further I will show what the advocates of the bill say is the difference in the cost of construction, maintenance, and operation in this country and in Europe which makes one of the necessities for the subsidy. Is that going to disappear in five years or ten years or fifteen years if it exists? I do not believe it exists, but if it does, it is going to disappear in the years when this pampered industry runs the limit of this bill. Does anybody believe it will not be here again knocking at the door for a larger subsidy than it asks now?

They give us an apt illustration of this. They say we subsidized the Collins Line, and it put down rates of transportation 33 per cent, and it was flourishing, carrying the flag of the Union across the ocean, but as soon as the subsidy was withdrawn they say it collapsed. Who can tell me that all these other lines, the history of which—if this bill passes—is so brilliantly depicted here, will not collapse in the same way at the end of fifteen years? You can not accomplish this by subsidies unless you are going to keep your hands in the Treasury of the United States forever, unless you overthrow this difference in conditions which exists between this country and European and foreign countries, if any such does exist. If those conditions are not overthrown, if we do not reach the point where we build ships and operate them as cheaply as other countries, this subsidy will simply have to be repeated time and again.

This measure is spoken of as being in the line of the great protective system which has brought about all this unexampled prosperity. I am not going into an argument on the tariff question, for I never did know anything about it; but I do know this

about the reasons which were advanced for it when it was first started. When the citizens of this country were notified that a system was to be adopted by which every time a man bought a coat, or a pair of shoes, or a pair of pants, every time he bought an article from the cradle to the grave, as long as he lived, he had to pay tribute to some manufacturing establishment, it was explained to him that that was to build up these infant industries, that that was to give them strength, so that they could develop our country.

He was told that he would have a market for his produce; that the industries would be enabled to compete with their foreign rivals, who produced manufactured articles with cheap labor, and whenever that time came then this policy should be abandoned. All admitted that it could not be sustained on principles of justice and fairness. It can never be said that as the question of pure justice and fairness you have a right to take a dollar out of my pocket to aid another man in his enterprise. Some great public reason must intervene, and we were told that it was necessary for the development of this country and to enable us to compete with foreign countries that this protective system should be introduced. It has been introduced.

Whether we should not have been in better condition and have been exporting more goods and be richer and happier if we never had it, I am not here to say. It is a problem I can not solve; but the time has come when the results, upon the happening of which the destruction of this system was promised, are here.

It is a well-known fact that we sell our manufactured products cheaper in foreign countries than we do at home. The people who seem to have got the benefit of this system, when it comes to a question of dollars and cents, are the foreigners. I am told that an agricultural implement can be made in the State of Illinois and shipped to South America and sold there for almost half what it is sold to the American farmer. This system has built up factories till we do not need them. There are more than we want. As I say, foreign countries have got the benefit of the cheap prices brought about by the system, and we have been given the wonderful blessing of the trust. Factories now, instead of being in demand, are being closed down; and yet this is but another step forward, they tell us, in this great protective system.

Mr. President, I have been unable to see, outside of the question of these three auxiliary ships, how it is that the people of the United States are going to be benefited as producers and as sellers by creating an entirely American marine and running every foreign ship out of the trade. If this bill is to produce the effects which the gentlemen claim for it, then all of this trade, the hundred and seventy-five millions which the Senator from New York so graphically described as being the amount we paid to foreign vessels, will go into the pockets of American shipowners.

I say American. I do not know how many foreigners may hold stock in the corporations that will build these lines. Nobody can tell. But instead of having ships from all over the world seeking our products, and anxious to carry them at low rates, you will have it all closed in American hands. I do not think the Anglo-Saxon or the American has ever been remarkable for forgetting his own interest. Give him a monopoly, and he will take advantage of it as quickly as any European that I ever heard of.

I repeat, outside of the auxiliary ships that we are to get under this bill, where the farmers and the producers and the ordinary citizens are to derive benefit I can not see. With the money that is intended to be expended in behalf of these private shipowners we could build a navy larger than the Navy we now have afloat. With one-tenth of the money, if needed, we could give bounties direct to the seaman himself and increase the demand for them; and yet this demand on the Treasury is justified by nearly all those who urge it here on the ground that we must have auxiliary ships and aid for our Navy in time of war.

Mr. President, let me go a little further. There are a great many of these figures here which confuse me. The Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW], who addressed us so eloquently on this subject the other day, said that the difference in the cost of constructing, maintaining, and operating vessels in England and the United States is 25 per cent in favor of England, and in that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] agrees with him, and from 30 to 40 per cent in favor of Belgium and the Netherlands. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in speaking of our glorious and happy condition, said:

Every separate State system, every separate railroad that she has—

That is, referring to Europe—

enhances the cost of her articles. Her mines are old. Ours are but just opened. We are beating her in all the great products. We have beaten her already in iron and steel.

The very products out of which ships are built.

We can turn them out at a price which Europe can not meet. We are going to surpass her in other articles. She will have to take her coal from us. It is a mere question of time when her last stronghold, the carrying trade, will be invaded. Already we can make steamship plates cheaper than she can make them. Only the other day I read in the newspapers that we had taken a contract in Glasgow for steel plates for commercial steamships

against all competitors, and we underbid them £50,000 on that one contract. We have taken it, and there are to-day in Glasgow 14 furnaces, they say, damped down.

Mr. President and Senators, who am I to believe in this conflict of opinion and evidence—the distinguished Senator from New York or the equally distinguished and eloquent Senator from Massachusetts? One says that we can not come up to England by 25 per cent. The other says we have underbid her on one contract by \$250,000 and have damped down 14 of her furnaces around the great city of Glasgow. Did the Senator from New York know that those furnaces had been damped down? Did he know that the operatives over there, by our wonderful superiority in these articles, have been thrown out of employment?

Let me go a little further as to the confusion on this point. I will quote from the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] for just a moment. He was asked about the provisions of the bill under which the owners of foreign ships were required to build other ships in this country before they could get the subsidy, and he said:

So far as I know, there are now two freight ships of 20,000 tons each building in American yards, the largest ships ever built in the world, which will come under the provisions of this bill undoubtedly, and ought to come under the provisions of this bill.

But the fact is that here, in the teeth of the assertion on the one side that we can not build ships in competition with England, the Senator from Maine says the two largest freight vessels in the world are now being built in American shipyards.

There is a gentleman by the name of Cramp who is supposed to have a little knowledge on this subject. Let us see what he said some eight years ago on this question. I read from the report of the minority of the committee in the House of Representatives on this bill, page 19. It is interesting reading, or at least when I consider what is said by the two Senators, the one from New York and the other from Maine, and compare it with what the Senator from Massachusetts says, it is confusing if not interesting. Here is what Mr. Cramp says:

The proper form in which to put the question is: Can you build a ship to do the work of the *City of New York* or the *Majestic* or the *Columbia* in all respects for the same cost?

Talking about American yards—

To that question I would reply: "Yes; or within as small a margin as would be likely to prevail in a similar case between any two British shipyards." * * *

In other words, the difference between a British shipyard and an American shipyard would be no more than would prevail between any two shipyards in the same country. He then goes on and says:

It is the fact that the "first cost" of ships is not only not a prime factor, but it is not even a serious factor, in any competition that may occur between this country and Great Britain for a share of the traffic of the ocean. * * *

We have had much dinning into our ears here about the great difference in the first cost of the ship, and here is this master shipbuilder, who knows the subject from alpha to omega, from beginning to end, and he says the difference in first cost cuts no figure. Now, he says:

American shipyards have built or are building about 40 naval vessels of numerous rates and types, all of the very highest and effective class in the world; and this development has been crowded into a space of about seven years. * * *

The disparity of cost of naval ships between our yards and those of Great Britain, ton for ton, gun for gun, and performance for performance, has dwindled in seven years until, in the case of the three latest battle ships, the margin between our classes and those of similar construction abroad may be expressed by a very small figure. * * *

If the current policy of naval reconstruction be pursued for another decade (1902), coupled with a vigorous and consistent execution of the measures recently enacted in behalf of the merchant marine, the question which forms the subject of this paper will be asked no more; unless, indeed, its point should be reversed and Englishmen be asking one another, Can we build ships as economically as they can in the United States?

That is what Mr. Cramp says on this subject; and all that without any question of subsidy; all that from the progress we have made in our own natural efforts, without any stimulating agency.

Now, let me go a little further. I have an article here that I took from the Washington Post of last Sunday morning. It contains a few little remarks about shipyards in Maine. I will just read a quotation from it:

Among the important industries to which attention has been attracted by the recent discussion anent the ship-subsidy bill there is, of course, none more prominent than that of shipbuilding. The shipbuilding industry in Maine is now at the top notch, with an absolutely unsurpassed record for the past year. Vessels aggregating 55,000 tons were built in the "Maine districts" during the year 1900, an increase of 10,000 tons over the previous year, while the contracts for 1901 warrant an estimate of at least 60,000 tons.

That is the way Maine is getting on without a subsidy.

Now, let us see what the President of the United States had to say about this when he was addressing the Commercial Club in Chicago. I read that from the minority report of the House of Representatives committee, on page 2. Here is what the President said October 10, 1899, in his speech at the Commercial Club at Chicago at a banquet. I do not know whether it was made at the latter part of the banquet or the first part, but here it is:

Our shipbuilding has been greatly increased. For the first time in all our history the tonnage of our steam vessels exceeded on June 1 the tonnage of

all our sailing vessels, barges, and other craft. We built in 1897 and 1898 more vessels of steel than of all other materials combined. Our tonnage increased during the year 100,000 tons, and is without a parallel in our recent history.

Now, listen:

More large ocean steamships are under construction in the United States than ever before. Our shipbuilding plants are being enlarged and new establishments projected.

That is what the President of the United States said. I must confess, Mr. President and Senators, I believe I will yield my conviction to the side of the President as against the two Senators.

Now, let me go a step further. This little book that was placed on our desks this morning, *The Shipping Industry of the United States and its Relation to the Foreign Trade*, states the same facts that are stated by the President and by these other persons, including Mr. Cramp, and shows that our shipyards are constantly increasing in capacity.

Mr. President, I want to just pursue this a little further. When you come to the question as to whether there is really a difference between the cost of construction in foreign countries and in this, a man gets lost in the contradictory testimony that is offered by the supporters of this bill; but there are some things I can not understand if there is that difference and if this bill is correct.

Suppose the Senator from New York [Mr. DEWEY] is right and there is a difference in England's favor and against us of 25 per cent, and in Norway and Belgium in their favor and against us of 30 to 40 per cent, one thing I can not understand, if those figures are true, is why Norway and Belgium have not taken away shipbuilding from England. Of course, on those figures Norway and Belgium have the advantage over England of 10 to 15 per cent. While the Senator from New York and other Senators say that an American would not dare build a ship in an American shipyard and expect to run it in foreign commerce, the Senator from Maine tells us the two biggest ships in the world are now being built in these yards.

But if the Senator from New York is right, and if an American can not build a ship in American yards because of this difference, how is it that the Englishmen can build their ships in their yards when right across the channel there are two countries that build ships from 10 to 15 per cent cheaper? Do they do it from patriotism? Do they persist in building ships in their own yards at a great loss simply to keep up England's glory? If that were true, I would hope that Americans are none the less patriotic than Englishmen, that they would see them and go them one better, and where Englishmen were willing to pay 15 per cent more for their ships in order to keep up English glory, we would be willing to pay 25 per cent more in order to keep up American glory.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator from Tennessee allow me to ask him one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. TURLEY. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. How is it, if we can build and operate ships cheaper than any other country, that we pay out \$175,000,000 to foreigners to do our carrying trade and our people are not engaged in that trade?

Mr. TURLEY. Mr. President, I am seeking light on this bill myself. The Senator's question is—

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is not true—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TURLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask the Senator from Tennessee, is it not true that during the last three, four, or five years in the United States iron and steel have become much cheaper, that they are cheaper in our own country now than in England, and that the cost of material going to construct ships is much cheaper now than it has been at any time heretofore?

Mr. TURLEY. That is exactly what I have shown according to the statement here.

Mr. STEWART. That does not answer my question.

Mr. TURLEY. Like the Irishman, I will answer the Senator's question by asking a question in return.

Mr. STEWART. All right.

Mr. TURLEY. I will ask him to explain, if Sweden and Norway construct and operate and maintain ships from 10 to 15 and 25 per cent cheaper than England, how is it that the Englishmen do not go over there and get all their ships, and why the industry in England is not destroyed?

Mr. STEWART. May I answer that question?

Mr. TURLEY. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. I have great faith in the ability and energy and enterprise of the American people. I believe that they will take the lead in any industrial enterprise where they have an equal showing. The fact that they do not lead in the carrying trade, the fact that they have to hire others to do it, is pretty conclusive evidence, to my mind, that for some reason they have not got an equal showing. That is what I want to have the Senator explain.

Mr. TURLEY. I will give another reason for it. I started out by saying, Mr. President, that I was not familiar with all the details of the subject. I have no doubt a great many questions will be asked that I can not answer, but I have listened somewhat to the arguments. I will answer the Senator in the reasons given by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], who is said to be as familiar with this subject as it is possible for any one man to be. I have shown you what a great many of the authorities have said about our steel being cheaper and our iron being cheaper and our capacity to build being equal to the capacity to build abroad, as Mr. Cramp says.

Now, the Senator from Maine said, and it seemed to me there was a great deal of force in it (I do not know whether his reason will be satisfactory to the Senator or not), that heretofore we have been getting rich so fast in railroads and manufactories and all sorts of internal trade, compared with which foreign and ocean commerce is a mere bagatelle, we have not had time to think about building ships; that our money has been so much more profitably employed, that we could get so much larger interest on the investments into which it went, that we have not had time to think about this industry.

We have got the cheap coal; we have got the cheap iron; we have got the cheap steel; we have got the cheap material; we have got the shipyards. The President says they are increasing. They are growing in Maine. So many of them are growing on the Great Lakes that they have gone into a trust. We have got all these, but we have had so many more uses for our money that we have not had time to hunt up this industry. But now, the Senator says, we have grown so rich and developed so much in these other things, if we can toll it, just like you drop corn to the hogs and get them to follow it a little, giving them \$180,000,000 or \$190,000,000—not that they need it, but just to show them the way to the crib—then you will have all the money you need in order to build these ships. Now, that is what the Senator from Maine tells us.

Mr. STEWART. Is that quite fair to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TURLEY. That is what I understood the argument of the Senator from Maine to be.

Mr. STEWART. Has the Senator from Tennessee stated the whole view of the Senator from Maine? Did not the Senator from Maine at the same time say that other governments subsidized their ships, legislated in their favor, gave them governmental advantage against which private parties could not compete?

Mr. TURLEY. I am going to comment on what the Senator from Maine said.

Mr. STEWART. That is, I believe, the reason he assigned why our merchant marine needs aid. He gave us an instance of the taking off of the Collins Line and all that. He showed us that that was the difference, and the Senator will not deny that that difference exists. I should like to have his view as to whether—

Mr. TURLEY. Not of my own knowledge. I only know what other people tell me. I understood the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], who, next to the Senator from Maine—I will not put him up with the Senator from Maine—understands this subject as well as any other man in the Senate, says that not 3 per cent of English ships get the benefit of any subsidy.

Mr. STEWART. I am not arguing on the percentage of ships at all, or what they get, but that they get something is very evident. All admit that they do the carrying trade and our ships do not do it. The fact that this great enterprise is done by foreigners, it seems to me, indicates that they have some advantage.

Mr. TURLEY. They get something in the way of mail pay.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee permit me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TURLEY. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator from Nevada will examine the Report of the Commissioner of Navigation, one of the committee of twenty-five, for 1899, he will find a very lucid explanation of the condition to which he has alluded and about which he has questioned the Senator from Tennessee. The Commissioner says, and I have no doubt it is true, that for a number of years—that was some eight or ten years ago—there was a disparity in the cost of constructing vessels and running them under the American flag and under foreign flags.

England having the iron and steel and coal and limestone in the vicinity of the ocean, and also the skilled workmanship, was enabled to build ships cheaper than we could build them here. Our navigation laws, says the Commissioner of Navigation—and that is unquestionably true—drove our ships from the ocean. They did not permit an American citizen to buy where he could buy the cheapest and put his ship under our flag, and, as a matter of course, our merchant marine decayed and has almost died.

It is unnecessary for me to remind the Senator from Nevada that when you strike down an industry, great or small, it can not be revived in a day or a year, or even in a decade. We are now manufacturing iron and sending it abroad. We are sending thousands

and thousands of tons of coal abroad and selling it there. We are enabled, as Mr. Cramp tells us, and as experience shows, to build vessels cheaper here than abroad. The best proof of that is the fact that three years ago Japan wanted to have a battle ship built and advertised for the lowest and best bidder. Armstrong, on the Clyde, the greatest shipbuilding establishment in Europe, made a bid. Mr. Cramp made a bid. The Germans bid. Cramp got the contract after having, as the newspapers stated, underbid Armstrong 20 per cent.

In a year afterwards Russia wanted to build a war ship costing \$2,500,000 and advertised for the lowest and best bidder, and Cramp received that contract in competition with the world. Two weeks ago Turkey advertised for the lowest and best bidder to build a \$3,500,000 battle ship, and Mr. Cramp has received the contract.

In the face of these facts there can be no doubt that conditions have changed. But our friends have selected a time when the merchant marine under the production of iron, and of coal, and by the increased skill of our workmen has just begun without subsidy to compete successfully to take \$180,000,000 out of the public Treasury.

Mr. STEWART. Then I understand the Senator to say that England subsidized her ships?

Mr. VEST. No, sir.

Mr. STEWART. Her carrying trade?

Mr. VEST. No, sir.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, yes; according to the report you read. It stated that they had an advantage for a long time from Government aid until they built it up.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will permit me, I did not want to get into a controversy—

Mr. STEWART. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. VEST. England had the advantage by reason of her superiority in the production of articles that went into the manufacture of iron ships.

Mr. STEWART. Without any Government aid?

Mr. VEST. Without any Government aid. I call the Senator's attention to the fact, which can not be controverted, that the merchant marine of England, which now has within 3 per cent of one-half of the entire carrying trade of the world, is in the iron tramps that never have received and never will receive one dollar of subsidy from Great Britain.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator deny that England ever subsidized or encouraged her foreign trade by means of large mail contracts, by running fast steamers?

Mr. VEST. England has never paid one dollar of subsidy within the meaning of this bill.

Mr. STEWART. Oh!

Mr. VEST. She has always paid for mail facilities. Her great colonial system necessitated that.

Mr. STEWART. I understand the fact to be, although I may not be as well posted as the Senator from Missouri, that when the Collins Line, an American line, was established England granted a subsidy to her mail line and ran it off, and she has been doing that. Thereby she established quick communication with all the world by her fast mail steamers, which corralled the commerce, until she built up a great monopoly or trust, against which no other country could make headway until they did likewise. France was helpless, and she has subsidized, too. Germany was helpless until she gave favorable legislation. England had an absolute monopoly as against France and Germany until they legislated. That is my recollection, but I am not so familiar with the details as the Senator.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I refer the Senator to the report of the Commissioner of Navigation.

Mr. STEWART. I would not have any faith in his report.

Mr. VEST. The Commissioner of Navigation says England never did subsidize her vessels.

Mr. STEWART. I have no faith in his report or in him either. I do not know him, and I do not care who he is.

Mr. VEST. I am glad to find one subject upon which the Senator and I can agree.

Mr. STEWART. That is my opinion of a man who gets into an office and makes an argument against the bald facts. The world knows that France and Germany were helpless against England until they aided their shipbuilding and their carrying trade. They had to do it by legislation, and they are doing it now. Germany is doing it, and the country that does not do it will be left in the background. I know the fact is that we do not have the carrying trade. I believe our people will do it if they have a showing and that they will beat any people in the world. But the fact that they are not doing it is satisfactory proof to me that they need legislation.

Other countries have had it, and we need it in order that we may have the carrying trade. The most important consideration that can be brought before Congress at this time is to have a carrying trade. We do not have it, and the reason we do not have it is because there is some obstacle. It is not because the American

people are not enterprising. They will not do it without a showing.

Mr. TURLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is entitled to the floor and will proceed.

Mr. TURLEY. The Senator from Nevada ought not to forget that the Commissioner of Navigation has seen a new light lately, and he is arguing on the other side of the question now. I do not know how that is.

Now, Mr. President, I want to go on a little further and make just one or two points, because, as I said at the beginning, it is a subject with which I am not familiar. I state now the things that trouble me, that I do not understand, and that I can not work out.

For instance, the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] says that we are giving in this bounty only the exact amount that will equalize the American shipbuilders with the foreign shipbuilders. How can that be when the amount of difference between the American shipbuilders and foreign shipbuilders is not the same in different countries? If it equalizes the American shipbuilders with English shipbuilders, it does not do it with the shipbuilders of Norway and Belgium and other countries and leaves us still at a disadvantage. Then why give the bounty? Now, take what the Senator from Maine said on that point. He said in his last speech, in giving the amount of bounties to different ships:

Those figures were reached with the greatest possible care, the only purpose being to equalize the conditions of the British ship and the American ship. The committee did not take the ships which can carry at the lowest possible cost.

He is talking about these fast ships. Does that equalize the British ship and the American ship? Now, let me go a little further. When he comes to state in the same speech how economical the favorers of this measure have been, how little they propose to take when they could take so much more if they only wanted to do so, he says:

In the Peninsular and Oriental, which is one of the first steamship lines subsidized by Great Britain, the British contract—

That is the mail contract—

called for \$1,650,297 a year.

Then he says:

For exactly the same line of American steamships, making exactly the same voyages, under all the terms of this bill it would be \$1,146,941, nearly \$500,000 less than what Great Britain pays.

Mr. President, what troubles me is how this bounty is going to help these ships. Here he says we give exactly that which is equivalent to the difference in the cost of construction, maintenance, and operation between the United States and Great Britain, and yet the very ships which receive the largest part of this bounty have to compete with English ships which he says are subsidized much larger than we propose to subsidize ours.

Now, what good will the bounty do them if that original difference in cost for them exists? I am assuming that the arguments of the Senator from New York and the other advocates of this bill are correct and that this difference does exist. I say if that is true this bounty leaves the ships just as it found them. It leaves them competing with British ships, that the Senator from Maine said are subsidized much more than ours are proposed to be subsidized, and all the difference which he pictures of the cost of maintenance and operation and building. Why give the bounty to those lines of ships?

I should like to have somebody explain to me, if there is this difference in the cost of operation and maintenance, in other words, if the English ships which the Senator from Maine described cost 25 per cent less to build, operate, and maintain and are subsidized for \$500,000 more than we propose to give to an American ship, how we are going to benefit that American ship by giving it the bounty. It is pouring the money into a rat hole; it will do no good. I can not understand how they work out those figures.

But, Mr. President, one of the most peculiar arguments in favor of this bill I find in the speech of the Senator from New York. It is what I call the percentage argument. The Senator from New York said in most eloquent language that we paid last year for pensions \$145,000,000, and he applied the percentage of 6 to that, and said because 6 per cent on \$145,000,000 would be \$8,700,000, therefore this bill ought to be adopted. That is the substance of his argument. This is his language:

We paid last year for pensions \$145,000,000. This sum is the annual expression in money of the gratitude of the country to those who have fought its battles and won its victories.

Six per cent upon this sum would carry the American flag, for which these men fought, upon American ships, loaded with the products of the American farm and factory, to every country on the globe. The river and harbor bill this year as it passed the House carries \$90,000,000, of which one-quarter is for local pride and local sportsmen—

"Spoilsmen," I suppose, though it says "sportsmen." I did not know that anybody who supported this bill was a "sportsman"—

and three-quarters, or \$45,000,000, to improve American facilities for foreign

ships. We appropriate over \$100,000,000 for the Army and \$77,000,000 for the Navy, and 4 per cent upon this would carry the American flag upon American merchant vessels, laden with the products of American industry, upon a mission of commerce, peace, and civilization all over the world.

Mr. President, this most magnificent argument might have been carried a little further. I have been looking through the expenses of the Senate to see how we spend our money, and I find that we are paying out annually \$50 for a mahogany, leather-covered, patent wood box. What people in the back counties, who bring in the back logs from behind the kitchen, will think of their Senators having their fires replenished from a fifty-dollar mahogany wood box I do not know. [Laughter.]

But the Senator from New York might have said with the same eloquent language that 18,000,000 per cent—for that is exactly what it is, Mr. President—18,000,000 per cent on this \$50, which we spend annually for a mahogany wood box, would carry the American flag upon an American merchant vessel laden with the products of American farms and American factories to every port of the habitable globe, and the argument would have been equally as strong.

Why, Mr. President, the Senator said this subsidy was an "automatic subsidy." Well, that argument is an automatic argument. [Laughter.] All you have to do is to shift the percentage and the figures to which you apply the percentage, and there is not a raid on the Treasury so glaring and so bold that you can not justify it by that argument.

Here we start with the river and harbor bill. I plead guilty as to that, and the only thing I can say is that I will never do it again. [Laughter.] When the river and harbor bill came over here I locked up my copy of the Constitution and put the key away where I could not find it for two or three days. I then started up to the room of the Committee on Commerce. At the foot of the elevator, much to my distress, I met my colleague [Mr. BATE] and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS], two strict constructionists.

I supposed they were going up to some other committee room to discuss some constitutional question; but, much to my surprise, they too got off at the door of the room of the Committee on Commerce. We all went into the committee room and found a goodly company who had got there before us. Some had come early; indeed, I heard of one Senator who had slept over night on the sofa on the principle that "the early bird catches the worm." [Laughter.]

I asked for a modest little appropriation of \$20,000 for a little river down in West Tennessee, in the bottom, the Big Hatchie, we call it. I intimated at the time that if my demand was excessive, I would accept \$10,000 and, if that was not consented to, I would yield to a still further "take off." [Laughter.] I did not know of the percentage argument at that time. If I had known of it, I would have hurled my appeal at this committee and said, "We spend \$145,000,000 a year for pensions. We need this appropriation for the Big Hatchie for a public purpose. One thousandth part of 1 per cent on this amount will carry American vessels, under the American flag, laden with American products, the output of American mills, to every port and landing on that river." [Laughter.] I could have said that there are miles and miles of that river where the American flag has never been seen for fifty years. [Laughter.]

My friend from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] could have applied that argument. He wants a little appropriation of half a million dollars or so for a beautiful little stream called the Ouachita. He could have said, "We spend \$100,000,000 a year for the Army." I say it for him now, so that any member of the Committee on Commerce who is present may hear it—"we expend over a hundred million dollars a year for the Army, and \$77,000,000 for the Navy. Now, about one five-hundredth per cent of that amount will carry the American flag upon American merchant vessels, laden with the products of American industry, upon a mission of commerce and peace and civilization to every port and landing on the beautiful Ouachita" [laughter]; and if there is anything that is needed, according to my information, on the upper part of that river, it is peace and civilization. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. President, I started to make a speech on the ship-subsidy bill, and I find I have got off on the river and harbor bill. So I believe I will leave the question.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, the New York Evening Post in a recent issue characterizes those in whose interest this bill is being pressed as "the most persistent and rapacious lot of bounty beggars that ever beset Congress." This at first sight would seem to be the language of denunciation, but a careful examination of what is proposed by the bill, the pretenses under which it is pressed, and the results which will actually come from its enactment would seem to demonstrate that, so far from being the language of vituperation, it is merely descriptive, and that under the circumstances the language is moderate, temperate, and apt.

The bill proposes to take millions of dollars out of the Treasury of the United States and make a free gift of it to certain persons because they are engaged in a particular business.

In 1898, for the purpose of raising revenue for an emergency, to

defray the expenses of the war then beginning, Congress levied taxes which have been since popularly denominated "war taxes." These taxes, in connection with others theretofore in existence, yield now an annual surplus of \$80,000,000. There is at this time pending in this body a bill, which has passed the House of Representatives, proposing to reduce this taxation and revenue. There can be no justification for the levying of taxes except for public purposes, and to retain a part of these excessive taxes now being levied for the purpose of providing millions of dollars as a free gift to certain individuals is an unjust and oppressive exercise of the power of taxation, and the country ought to, and I believe will, repudiate it.

The millions of money which are designed to be donated to these shipowners must be raised from all classes of the community, and unfortunately the contributions so required are not levied in proportion to property, and not upon property, but in thousands of cases they are levied upon the poverty and misfortunes of those who have no property—upon the medicines consumed in sickness, on the poor man's luxury, tobacco, on every necessary of life almost these taxes are levied. A man unable to pay a debt and compelled by poverty to execute his note for the future payment of it must pay a penalty for his poverty by a stamp on his note, and if further required to secure his obligation by a mortgage, that, too, must pay tribute to the Federal Treasury. These burdensome taxes should only be imposed in cases of the greatest necessity, and should never be imposed or maintained for the purpose of conferring a bounty, a free gift, upon a lot of "subsidy beggars" to enable them to swell their already overgrown fortunes and to make an already profitable business pay increased dividends.

This bill has been protested against by all classes of citizens and from every section of the country. To quote the language of an influential newspaper in a recent exhaustive article on this subject—

Thousands of prominent business men, college professors, and trade organizations have pronounced against it. The press, except when muzzled by party pressure, has been outspoken in its condemnation of the scheme, which, if not submerged under a wave of popular indignation, might easily grow into a scandal as disgraceful as that of the Pacific Mail subsidy of thirty years ago.

It has been denounced by that great body of organized labor which embraces a million and a half of workmen, the Federation of Labor. The National Grange and many State Granges, representing millions of men and capital engaged in the pursuit of agriculture, have joined in the general denunciation of the scheme, and different business organizations in all sections of the country, and from all classes in country, cities, and towns, have joined in the general chorus of condemnation.

It is true that some time since a persistent effort was made to create the impression that there was some popular demand for the passage of this bill by getting up and sending to Congress a number of petitions praying for its passage. It seems that a Mr. A. R. Smith, one of the 25 men who have gotten up and are pushing this bill, had written letters to certain so-called business organizations, many of them with high-sounding names, with little or no membership, representing nothing, speaking for nobody, to send petitions to Congress, and that this was promptly done. Hon. John De Witt Warner, of New York, took the trouble to investigate the good faith of these alleged petitions, and ascertained that they are largely practical frauds and represent no public sentiment, and this exposure is now public property.

The proposition is called "a bill to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and to provide auxiliary cruisers and transports and seamen for Government use when necessary." The title is attractive enough, calculated to soothe the public mind, and to allay all apprehension. Judging from the title alone, the purposes of the bill would seem to be high and patriotic. But when the measure itself is studied, and the effects that must flow from it are distinctly understood, it would seem than a title actually descriptive of the bill, its purposes and effects, should read: "A bill to enable a select coterie of shipowners to levy taxes on the public, to loot the Treasury of the United States, and to drive out all American competition from the high seas to enable this favored set of 'bounty beggars' to monopolize this trade so far as American commerce is concerned."

I have not the honor of being a member of the Committee on Commerce, and have therefore not had the advantage of hearing all the statements before that committee in favor of and against this bill. The question is one of great public importance, one in which every citizen of the country has a pecuniary as well as a patriotic interest, and there are connected with it many facts which may be readily comprehended by one who is not an expert. It is a few of these simple and patent facts that I wish to present for the consideration of the Senate.

Business will grow and develop under favorable conditions, and will die out under unfavorable conditions, without regard to artificial stimulation, and the building and sailing of ships, it seems to me, like any other practical business, will be governed by the

same rules of common sense which govern other business enterprises.

Any very large increase in the commerce of this country must involve the transportation of our agricultural products on advantageous terms as an absolute necessity, for the great bulk of our exports is yet the product of our farms. The general public are expected to believe that the passage of this bill is intended to and will increase the exports of our agricultural products, and we are assured by its friends that its enactment will greatly decrease freight rates in the immediate future. That this bill is not intended to benefit agriculture, or to promote the growth of commerce in agricultural products, is distinctly apparent when we look at the compensation given under it, as it was reported to the Senate during last month to the floating palaces of the ocean, magnificent ships engaged in carrying passengers, with lightning speed from our own shores abroad to become buyers in European markets, as compared with the freight-carrying ships, the ships which actually transport our commerce.

A 21-knot ship of 10,000 tons must necessarily have very much the larger part of her space occupied by machinery, coal bunkers, etc., and in the very nature of things can carry little except passengers and fine freight, and, as is well known, they do, in fact, carry nothing else; they are not built or intended for anything else. One of these splendid ships would earn under the provisions of this bill as originally reported, sailing 21 knots an hour, carrying its hundreds of pleasure seekers, about \$1,900 a day, while a freighter of the same tonnage, capable of carrying, perhaps, six times as much freight as the faster steamer, but carrying no passengers, would earn about \$360 per day. This simple illustration clearly shows the insincerity of the pretense that the purpose of this bill as reported was to build up foreign commerce.

If further proof of this is needed it can be found in a statement of what is actually done, which was presented to the Senate in the beginning of this debate by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY], a member of the Committee on Commerce, and who delivered a most instructive and carefully prepared speech at that time, wherein he presented to the Senate the actual manifests of a number of these large ships, fast and slow.

I quote below one comparative statement showing the actual freight carried by two large steamers of these different classes, sailing as near as may be at the same time. This one illustration out of the number presented by him is sufficient for my purpose. Compare the quantity of agricultural products carried by these two ships. Under the provisions of this bill the *St. Louis*, sailing 21 knots per hour, would receive \$304,290, and the *Georgic*, sailing 13 knots per hour, \$90,150 per annum.

Amount of farm products carried by the *Georgic* and the *St. Louis*.

Freight conveyed.	<i>Georgic</i> , 13-knot ship.	<i>St. Louis</i> , 21-knot ship.
Corn	85,416	None.
Oats	6,900	None.
Hay	117,290	None.
Straw	12,005	None.
Flour	355	None.
Cattle	919	None.
Horses	127	None.
Wheat	29,917	None.
Cotton	10,965	None.
Barley	9,655	None.
Cheese	571	347
Bacon	1,624	4,250
Pork	6,061	3,571
Beef	4,368	None.
Tongue	30	10
Tallow	250	None.
Mutton	131	None.
Wood	648	None.
Hams	123	12

We have here an actual illustration of precisely what these two classes of ships are doing now and what they were intended to do, and the compensation intended to be paid to each.

Mr. J. J. Hill, president of the Great Northern Railroad, is reported in the papers to have said recently that—

The proposed ship subsidy will be an excellent thing if it is not abused. I believe if the Government would pay a tonnage on the actual commodity carried below a certain value a ton, based on the distance carried, there would be some justice in it. Unfortunately, the kind of ships that will receive the subsidy is one that may, indeed, need it, but which the country does not need.

The first bill introduced appropriated \$9,000,000 a year in subsidies, of which \$7,300,000 would have gone to the American Line. The owners of this line are good friends of mine, certainly they are when I am crossing the ocean, but think of the country paying at least seven-eighths of the \$9,000,000 a year to 10 or 12 ships. I called attention to this feature of the bill, and it was amended. Whatever is done with the \$9,000,000, it ought to be distributed pro rata among all the ships flying the American flag.

In a new bill about 30 per cent was set apart for the Pacific Ocean, and I suppose it was thought that that was a good thing for me. Perhaps it is financially. But my company is building ships without the subsidy. The nation would better take off the duty on ships and plates, and in time we can build as cheaply in the United States as anywhere. If the appropriation is

made for a class of ships that will reduce the cost of carrying grain and products to new markets. I feel it will do well, but if it is insisted on giving the bulk of the money to ships with no other recommendation than that they can make 21 knots on a trial trip it will be all wrong.

And this is just what this bill proposes.

In 1896 the Republican party, in national convention assembled, by a unanimous vote, I believe, in a convention composed of delegates from every section of the Union, declared that—

We favor restoring the American policy of discriminating duties for the upbuilding of our merchant marine and the protection of our shipping in the foreign carrying trade, so that American ships—the product of American labor, employed in American shipyards, sailing under the Stars and Stripes, and manned, officered, and owned by Americans—may regain the carrying of our foreign commerce.

And President McKinley, in his letter of acceptance in 1896, said:

The declaration of the Republican platform in favor of the upbuilding of our merchant marine has my hearty approval. The policy of discriminating duties in favor of our shipping, which prevailed in the early years of our history, should be again promptly adopted by Congress and vigorously supported until our prestige and supremacy on the seas are fully attained.

This was a declaration in favor of giving an advantage to American ships in proportion to their participation in the foreign trade. A ship under this plan would be paid exactly in proportion to its participation in this trade. No advantage would be given for carrying passengers, no advantage would be given for fast sailing, no advantage would be given to more expensively fitted and costly type of ships over those which were doing the substantial work of commerce. From the time of this declaration on the part of the Republican party in 1896 down to this hour, however, there seems never to have been any intention manifested anywhere of redeeming this pledge made to the people, and the Senator from Maine has during the course of this debate informed the country that to attempt to redeem this Republican pledge would involve us in entanglements which would be practically interminable. Everyone understands that in the infancy of our Republic there was a great prejudice against us in all European countries and discriminations against us of all kinds were indulged in.

Amongst other discriminations was that of discriminating duties. Under this system one rate of customs duties was fixed upon goods brought in in their own ships and a higher rate of duties was charged upon goods arriving in American ships. These discriminations made it impossible, of course, for our ships to compete with theirs in their carrying trade, and we were compelled either to abandon the effort to become a maritime nation or to adopt some measure of retaliation which would compel them to desist from this course of discrimination against us.

Our Government had just been organized on a new theory which was not received with favor in the Old World. We advocated and believed in the equality of all men and in equal rights for all nations as well as all men. We believed in an "open door" to all the world in all commercial enterprise, and that the most capable should have the benefit of his own superiority in an open, free, and fair contest.

This system of discriminating duties begun by Europe was commercial warfare waged against us, and we were compelled in self-defense, contrary to the wishes of our statesmen of the time, to resort to similar discriminations against them, to compel them to cease their warfare against us. Our imposition of discriminating duties was a measure of retaliation, a measure of commercial war, which our statesmen knew would be harmful both to us and European nations, but, like other measures of retaliation and punishment, these were necessary for self-defense under the then existing conditions.

The purpose for which this class of duties was levied by us was accomplished. Europe was compelled to abandon discriminations against us, to enter upon a more enlightened policy, and to treat our ships fairly; and our young Government, in compelling this forward step by the nations of the Old World, this elevation of international morals, gave an earnest of what its great work might be expected to be in leading the way to more liberal, humane, and statesmanlike views in the intercourse amongst all nations in the future. To return to this old system of narrowness and selfishness now, when there is not the slightest reason for it, would be a step in the direction of the Dark Ages. It is surprising that a national convention of a great party should, in the dawn of the twentieth century, declare itself in favor of such a system, and amazing that a candidate for the Presidency should express his strong approval of it.

It is notable, however, that there has never been the slightest move toward redeeming this promise. But this was the policy declared for by the Republican party; this was the promise it made to the people; this was the plan that the whole party indorsed; and this plan, as an aid to commerce, would be infinitely superior, bad and unenlightened as it is, to the one now proposed, because under that system the money taken from the Treasury of the United States and paid to the ships' owners would be in exact proportion to their participation in the foreign trade, and regulated by it. Ships which carried great cargoes would get large pay, and fast-sailing ships with small cargoes would get small pay—compensation would be proportioned exactly to participa-

tion in commerce. The present proposition, however, while making a pretense of promoting commerce, is really intended to enrich a class of expensive and costly ships which really have nothing to do with our carrying trade, and which, as suggested by Mr. HILL, the country does not need.

The ringing declaration in favor of "American ships, the product of American labor, built in American shipyards, and manned and officered by Americans," which was captivating to American ears in the campaign and when votes were needed, seems to have been entirely forgotten after the election was won. Were these glowing promises ever intended to be kept, or were they a tissue of false pretenses deliberately used with malice aforethought to catch votes? If this was not a deliberate and willful false pretense, why has there never been anywhere one single exhibition of even a desire to redeem this pledge? It has been long since 1896, but there has been no new light thrown on this subject since that time. All the facts connected with discriminating duties were just as well known then as they are now.

If anybody—if one single man—believed that declaration of the Republican platform, then why has not somebody tried to redeem it? So far from there seeming to have been any purpose to redeem this pledge, it would seem that the reverse is true, for the very next year, as we learn from the statement of the Senator from Maine himself, the persons who are responsible for the present scheme were by him appointed a committee to prepare a shipping bill. A bill was introduced the next year; and bill has followed bill, as changeable in form and substance as the colors of the chameleon, but not one anywhere proposing American ships, built by American labor in American shipyards, and manned and officered by Americans. All these fine words seem to have been intended to conceal the real idea, the actual purpose. How many foreign ships, built by foreign labor in foreign shipyards, will, under this bill, be permitted to register under the American flag for the purpose of drawing enormous sums of money, the product of American labor, from the American Treasury? How many of these will be permitted and authorized to levy toll upon the property, the labor, and the necessities of the American people to increase the profits of these foreign-built ships which are already profitable?

We are told by men familiar with the subject that the effect of the passage of this bill will be to enable these favorites of the Government, these "subsidy beggars," to organize a combination which can and will absolutely hold in their own hands the ocean freights in the foreign carrying trade of this country, in so far as Americans participate in it.

The report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1900 shows that there are owned by Americans foreign-built ships now as follows:

	Ships.	Tons.
International Navigation Company	15	101,789
Atlantic Transport Company	16	114,196
F. E. Bliss	8	30,602
W. R. Grace & Co.	6	21,599
T. Hogan & Sons	12	47,144
United Fruit Company	2	3,219
Total	59	318,549

Mr. G. L. Du Val, who states that he is here as a representative of the Merchants' Association of New York, said in a letter recently explaining his connection with and knowledge of this subject:

I have devoted my entire business life to the American foreign trade—export and import—and Flint, Eddy & American Trading Company, of which I have the honor to be a director, are to-day the largest exporters of American manufactured products, their business requiring the employment inward and outward of between 800,000 and 1,000,000 tons per annum. I am therefore in a position to estimate the effect of the proposed legislation upon American commerce generally, and I believe the consensus of opinion is that a very serious handicap would be put upon the export merchants by such discrimination as the proposed bill would provide in favor of a few.

I hope to be able to show before I conclude that, if present conditions are allowed to take their natural course, we will in the near future take our place among the great shipbuilding nations of the world. But this man, claiming expert knowledge gained by years of extensive business experience, believes that this bill, if enacted into law, will not only not tend to build up our merchant marine, but that it will forestall and prevent that natural development which I believe we are about to enter upon, and that this bill will place the power in the hands of the coterie of shipowners under it, to monopolize, so far as Americans are concerned, our foreign carrying trade, thus placing at their mercy the merchants on the one hand and the shipyards on the other. He says:

You asked me how the small extent of foreign tonnage which it is proposed to admit to American register and half subsidy could materially affect the interests of the export trade, and I showed you this by a few figures, which I will refer to herein.

From the best judgment I can form as to the extent of foreign tonnage

that would be eligible to American registry and half subsidy under the terms of the bill as at present framed, instead of some 300,000 tons, as estimated by the committee, it will be between 400,000 and 500,000 tons net register, while under the terms of the bill the definition of the word "ton" in respect of the payment of subsidy is given as the "gross cargo ton."

Take, therefore, an ownership in 500,000 net-register tons, representing a carrying capacity (weight and measurement) of about 1,250,000 tons:

Fifty thousand net-register tons equal 125,000 cargo tons applied to the Australian trade—a voyage of 14,000 miles—would gain a subsidy of \$92,500, or 74 cents per ton. This 74 cents would be a margin which the owner of that amount of tonnage could employ to keep competing tonnage out of that trade; indeed, it would several times enable them to accomplish that object, for I need not tell you that a difference of 15 or 20 cents a ton in the cost of transporting bulky staples is controlling in any large export business. Of course, the entire Australian trade would not be served by the 125,000 cargo tons referred to, but the owners of that tonnage would be in position to charter a sufficient amount more, say twice the quantity, and bring their total control up to, say, 400,000 tons (which would come very near covering the requirements), and distribute the \$92,500 over their entire fleet, representing a margin of 23 cents per ton on the entire traffic.

This, however, would be only a part of the case, for with that margin, which they could at any and all times sacrifice before they incurred a loss in competing with independent shipowners, they could advance their freight rates and, through a system of contracts and preferential rates, pledge to themselves the support of the shippers, who must rely upon a uniform service. If, then, the advance in their rates should encourage outside opposition, as soon as other tonnage was offered their rates would be dropped again to a basis that would represent a loss to the opposition, which trial, after several futile attempts, would ultimately be abandoned, and leave the owners of the subsidized ships in complete control.

This is by no means an imaginary hypothesis, for precisely the same lines were followed by a group of shipping houses in New York controlling the freighting facilities to Australia, from which they reaped a profit of millions of dollars over the term of their control, keeping the freight rates at exorbitant figures, dropping them again as soon as opposition offered, requiring outside shippers to contract with them or lose the benefits that they could offer from a regular service, allotting a considerable proportion of their enormous profits to a reserve account to fight opposition. Persistence in that course became very costly to the outsider, and while many attempts were made they were always abandoned, and the freighting trust triumphed in the end. At length, however, a determined opposition, through the aggregation of several steamship interests, was made against this freighting trust, which presently came to the end of its reserve fund, and its power was broken. This is measurably true of any similar contest that might be waged, but in the case we are considering, of subsidized ships, the opposition would practically be in conflict with the Government and bound to fight against its resources, which, of course, would be hopeless.

It would thus seem that in addition to the looting of the Treasury that this bill is intended to make a great shipping trust possible. Can the American Congress deliberately become a party to such a scheme? I sincerely hope not. It would be unpardonable to do so. The whole brood of trusts, organized by combining rival and competing business enterprises for the purpose of suppressing competition on the one hand, so as to obtain higher prices for their products, and for reducing the prices of their raw material and labor on the other hand, are public enemies and should be made to feel the strong arm of the law. These organizations are too numerous now, and instead of extending them to the sea also we should deal with those on the land which we already have.

But is this possibility of establishing a ship trust the real reason why no effort is made to carry out the solemn pledge of the Republican party made in 1896? Is this in reality a flank movement, under cover of a pretense to build up American ships, built in American yards, sailed by American seamen, etc., to accomplish an end which will make that purpose apparently absolutely impossible?

There is an old adage that in vain is a net spread in sight of any bird. Whether this is equally true of members of Congress remains to be seen. But I am satisfied that whatever Congress may do, the people will hold each man here to a strict accountability for his share of responsibility for this measure.

It may be that it will be impossible to prevent the passage of this bill. It may be that its promoters have already rendered services to the Republican party which this bill is intended to compensate, and which that party is determined shall be compensated at the public expense; but I deem it a duty that we should resist its passage by every means in our power. We will try to expose its atrocities and its false pretenses, while a great array of leaders of thought in business all over the country, and at least a part of the press, will arouse the people to its utter selfishness, and I hope that its barefaced iniquities may at last overwhelm it.

When the Senator from Maine addressed the Senate at length in opening this debate, he told us of the persistent decline of the shipping interest of the United States during the last forty years or more, and explained quite at length a number of efforts made by himself and others to arrest this decline, and how all of these efforts had failed, and how the decline still went on. At the conclusion of his remarks the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] asked that Senator, very pertinently, I think, what was the cause of that decline, saying that he had patiently listened to the Senator from Maine, hoping to hear what was the cause of this persistent decadence; and he said that if he (the Senator from Colorado) once knew the cause of the decline, he would feel that he had begun to know something of the remedy. Now, I believe that the Senator from Colorado, in that request, stated the exact point which should claim our attention first. The Senator from Maine replied, but did not answer, and until the answer is given

it is folly for us to proceed; it is useless for us to propose a remedy until we know what has caused the trouble. It behooves us, then, to diligently inquire what is the trouble, and not to cease until that has been made clear.

There is an impression more or less general, and it has been stated on this floor during this debate, that this decadence began about 1860 or 1861, and that Confederate cruisers were perhaps the cause. A moment's consideration will show that this could not be true, for, if it had been the cause, as soon as the cause was removed our shipping would have regained its old-time power and importance, and this was not so. It is necessary to look more closely into this matter to find the truth. There must in the very nature of things be a cause, a continuing and a perfectly natural cause, for this steady and persistent effect which has existed without intermission for so many years.

When we had the best and cheapest material in the world for shipbuilding, and while we built the best and cheapest ships in the world we equaled Great Britain as carriers of the world's commerce, and equaled all the balance of the world combined. We were then carrying 75 per cent of our own exports and imports in open competition with the whole world, while 50 per cent of our tonnage was engaged in carrying commerce from one foreign country to another, and all this without subsidy or Government assistance of any kind and without a thought of it in the mind of any man, but when we were surpassed in these respects and became unable to build ships as cheaply as Great Britain, and at the same time stupidly refused to allow our merchants to buy ships from those who could build them cheaper than we could, then we naturally dropped out of the contest for carrying the world's commerce.

About the year 1830 steam as a propelling power instead of sails, and iron as a building material in the place of wood, were beginning to attract attention. The English people saw the natural advantages that we had in building wooden sailing ships, and with characteristic Anglo-Saxon energy, and without government aid of any kind, they set about developing the evolution in favor of steam and iron ships, and before 1840 it was clear to the shrewdest observers that sails and wood must fall behind. The English people made the most of this development and pushed forward in the construction of ocean iron and steam vessels. The Americans did not adopt the new method at once. It was natural that they should cling to the ships they were proud to believe were the best on earth, though after a few years they did become active in the use of steam and iron for ships. When we did begin, we pushed forward with such energy that by 1851 our steam tonnage almost equaled that of Great Britain, and it continued to increase until 1856.

By this time the conviction seems to have become settled in the minds of business men, seagoing men, that an iron ship was superior to a wooden one, and in the long run cheaper. The Americans, confident of the superiority of their splendid wooden ships, were perhaps slower than other people to recognize this fact; but those abroad who had been buying American ships saw and understood it; hence, the building of our wooden ships for use abroad began to fall off rapidly.

From building for foreign buyers 65,000 tons in 1855 there was a falling off in 1856 to 42,000 tons, and to 25,000 tons in 1858, and to 17,000 tons in 1860; so that this decadence had visibly begun before a gun was fired in 1861, and it began because iron was as surely displacing wood as the building material for ships as steam was superseding sails as the propelling power. It was simply impossible for us at that time to compete with England in the cheap production of iron, and as a protective tariff on iron made the importation of it into this country impossible, our shipbuilders were denied the privilege of having the cheapest and best material for building ships, and our people were denied ships as cheaply as other people could get them. The advantages which we had possessed theretofore had passed to our rival, and we were distanced in the race.

If when we found that this change was inevitable we had allowed our people to buy cheaper and better ships wherever they were to be had on the best terms, our merchant marine would not have perished from the earth. But it was somebody's idea that Americans must not have ships unless they were built in American shipyards, and as our yards, handicapped by our own tariff, could not build ships as cheaply as other people, the destruction of our merchant marine was inevitable, and our shipyards, so far as the foreign trade went, followed the same fate.

The nations of Europe all found that Great Britain had the same advantage of them as to cheaper materials, but, unlike us, they permitted their people to buy ships and remain in the trade, and wisely determined that even if they could not compete with England in building cheap ships that they would not, therefore, abandon the carrying trade of the world to her, but they bought ships from her, kept in the trade, and waited wisely for another development which would relieve them of their disadvantage. And now when the change seems to be at hand they have a standing

as carriers of the world's commerce, while we have practically none.

The decadence of American shipping was an unavoidable result of perfectly natural causes, and it seems to me that the way to restore it and to find ourselves among the shipbuilding and ship-owning nations of the world once more is to take hold of the natural advantages we have now, remove all the handicaps and barriers that embarrass our shipbuilders and shipowners, and allow them free access to the cheapest and best materials, and the cheapest and best ships that the world's markets afford.

If we can, after freeing our shipbuilders from every embarrassment, after giving them free access to the markets of the world for the material for building ships, they can build ships as cheaply as other people, let us open the way for this to be done, by their own efforts in fair and open competition with the world; but if they can not build ships as cheaply as other nations, then let us permit our people to buy the cheapest and best ships to be had and take care of themselves.

Can we build ships now in competition with Great Britain? The Commissioner of Navigation, one of the advocates of this bill, in his official report—a report, by the way, which is very much devoted to the passage of the pending measure—is compelled to admit that, to quote his own words—

When we can build as cheaply as Great Britain there is no reason why the United States should not share that country's profitable trade in supplying foreign flags with medium-sized cargo steamships, a trade which last year amounted to 138 steamships of 294,559 gross tons.

He concludes that we can not yet do this. Is this conclusion well founded? On page 31 of his official report the Commissioner gives the prices of steel ship plates in England and the United States in 1899 and 1900, as follows:

Price of steel ship plates.

	1899.								
	Apr.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
United States	\$50.40	\$50.40	\$50.40	\$56.00	\$56.00	\$67.20	\$67.20	\$67.20	\$67.20
Great Britain	34.63	34.63	35.84	36.45	37.06	37.06	37.06	38.88	38.88
	1900.								
	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.
United States	\$58.24	\$50.40	\$48.18	\$42.56	\$40.32	\$33.60	\$28.00	\$24.06	\$24.04
Great Britain	38.88	39.49	40.10	40.70	40.70	40.70	40.86	38.88	38.88

The Commissioner follows these tables, on the same page, with this statement:

In 1894 the plates of the *Dirigo*, the first steel square-rigged ship built in the United States, were imported from Great Britain. In 1898 we exported to Great Britain some of the plates for the British steamship *Oceanic*, the largest vessel afloat. During the past summer American steel ship plates have been quoted in British markets, though ocean freights have been \$5, and in some instances more. Special causes have, of course, been at work in both countries to produce the marked fluctuations in the prices of steel ship plates, but it is doubtless within bounds to assert that for the future, under normal conditions, the price of steel ship plates in the United States will usually be lower than in Great Britain. Our output of plates, of course, is thus far much smaller than the British, but every foreign purchase of American ship plates is indirectly a small contribution to the remote future of American shipping.

A recent issue of a prominent German paper is quoted as saying:

It is known that the American iron works eclipse those of all other countries, whether in the magnificence of their establishments or the methods of saving hand labor by technical devices or in facilities for reducing the cost of production through the wholesale scale of their manufactures.

And this journal admits that the break in the iron prices in Germany was caused by American imports.

I have seen a newspaper statement within the last few days in a Philadelphia paper, I think, that recently Glasgow builders had contracted for 150,000 tons of ship plates in this country at a saving of a quarter of a million of dollars, and this fact was mentioned a few days since in debate here by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

"There are now invested in shipyards in the United States fifty to fifty-five millions of dollars of capital, and 38,000 men are employed in them," as reported by the honorable Commissioner of Navigation, and they are now building 68 merchant steam vessels, aggregating 277,680 gross tons, and 47 naval vessels of 113,329 tons; and he adds that since this estimate was made 2 steel cargo steamships of 9,760 gross tons and 12 knots average speed are being built by the Maryland Steel Company.

If materials are now cheaper here than in Great Britain, the question of cheap construction becomes at once important. A recent issue of the *Scientific American* contains the following very suggestive article on this question:

THE RELATIVE COST OF STEAMSHIP CONSTRUCTION IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.

Among the papers presented at the recent general meeting of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers in this city was one by Mr. George Dickie, of the Union Iron Works, San Francisco, on the question "Can the

American shipbuilder under present conditions compete with the British and German shipbuilders in the production of the largest class of ocean passenger and freight steamships?"

The author of the paper recently made an extensive tour among the shipbuilding yards of Europe, one of the objects being to note what advantages foreign shipbuilders have over ourselves in skill, labor, and materials. The paper was written on board the *Saxonia*, a sister ship to the *Ivernia*, which, in an article published in the *Scientific American* of November 10, was taken as the latest representative of the large cargo and passenger steamers which are becoming increasingly popular among the shipowners of the present day.

Mr. Dickie's comparison between British and German and American methods is made under three heads—skill in design, cost of labor, and cost of material. As regards the question of skill, the British designers labor under the severe restrictions of Lloyd's Register, and Mr. Dickie gives them full credit for a thorough understanding of their profession and great skill in turning out economical designs that conform to the rigid requirements and restrictions of the Register. Given an American register of shipping that would lend itself more readily to the tendencies of American design, Mr. Dickie believes that the American architect will show himself to be quite abreast of his British cousin. As regards the cost of labor, it is shown that under our present methods labor cost in the United States is 25 per cent greater on the hull and 50 per cent greater on the machinery of an average ocean-going freight or passenger steamer.

It is just here, in discussing the cost of marine machinery, that the author brings out a fact which will be certainly very astounding to those of us who have believed that in economy of shop management we are far in the lead of Great Britain. As an explanation of the cheapness of British marine engine construction, he tells us that every part of the engine in a first-class establishment is made to gauge, and when finished by the tools is sent to an expert examiner at a large surface table, who determines if every operation performed by the tools has been accurately done. If the work is not perfectly accurate it is returned for correction, or, if not worth correction, is entirely rejected.

"The pieces thus produced that go to make an engine when brought together are not erected by fitting each piece to its place by file or chisel, but they are placed in stock ready to be assembled in a few hours on receipt of an order for an engine of the size they represent." The author is of the opinion that the introduction of a system to insure correct tooling on every piece entering into the construction of our marine engines would reduce the cost of erection by one-half. The full text of this valuable paper will be found in the current issue of the Supplement.

Note the language of the junior Senator from Massachusetts only a few days ago in this Chamber:

We are beating her in all the great products. We have beaten her already in iron and steel. We can turn them out at a price which Europe can not meet. We are going to surpass her in other articles. She will have to take her coal from us. It is a mere question of time when her last stronghold, the carrying trade, will be invaded. Already we can make steamship plates cheaper than she can make them. Only the other day I read in the newspapers that we had taken a contract in Glasgow for steel plates for commercial steamships against all competitors, and we underbid them £50,000 on that one contract. We have taken it, and there are to-day in Glasgow 14 furnaces, they say, damped down. What happens there will happen in the carrying trade. We shall build ships cheaper than they do.

Having seen what a shipbuilder thinks and what a Massachusetts statesman thinks, the views of a business man engaged in sailing ships will be interesting. I clip the following from a recent issue of the *Chicago Tribune*:

PROPOSED SUBSIDY SCHEME.

Mr. James J. Hill, of the Great Northern road, does not believe that the place where foreign trade is got is in the lobbies of the Capitol. He states his plan for getting that trade as follows:

"I propose to build as many vessels as the trade with the Orient will justify, and that will be a great many. The natural market for the Pacific coast is China, Japan, and the Philippines. The docks at Seattle are large enough to accommodate all the shipping for some time, but eventually other harbors will be used.

"It is too far from the Pacific coast to the Eastern States to ship many of the products of the Northwest to the East. A market for grain in the Orient will give the farmers a higher price for their grain. The products of the iron mines, of the coal mines, and of the lumber regions in the Northwest can be sold at better advantage in the markets of the Orient than can be had in the East. It is not like forcing something on the market that the people do not want. They want everything we can take to them, and we want their products. We shall have 25 steamships in this service within five years. The vessels will be of the largest size, with enormous carrying capacity and slow speed. Speed is not so much of an object as to be able to lay the goods down on the other side of the Pacific, so that they compete with the native products."

This statement is commented on editorially as follows:

The International Navigation Company ("American" Steamship Line) wants a subsidy of several million dollars a year to assist in securing foreign trade. Mr. Hill, believing that "the Lord helps those who help themselves," is going to build vessels and send them across the Pacific without a subsidy. Should the Hanna-Payne bill pass he will be one of the beneficiaries, but not on the same grand scale as the International Navigation Company.

The "ocean greyhounds" of the American Line, which carry comparatively little freight, would receive proportionately more than Mr. Hill's vessels, which would not be driven headlong across the ocean. Under the subsidy bill 11-knot vessels get only the same premium as sailing vessels, though making a trip in half the time.

The bulk of the ocean trade is done by steamers which go at a low rate of speed to save coal and diminish expenses in the fire room and in other ways. They carry, as a rule, cargoes the speedy delivery of which is not essential. The "tramp" steamers and the exclusively freight lines do the world's traffic, and yet receive cold treatment in a bill the professed object of which is to "build up American trade." The real object is to enrich the stockholders of the International Navigation Company—the American line—which is also closely affiliated with the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Standard Oil Company.

Subsidies are not necessary. Mr. Hill knows it; so do the men who are clamoring for the passage of the Hanna-Payne bill. But they see a chance to get subsidies and naturally want them. Being all of them skilled in such matters, they are moving heaven and earth to get through a measure more profitable than any they have yet been concerned in.

It is unnecessary for me to say who Mr. Hill is. His character and achievements as a business man are too well known for that, and both are too well known for anybody to believe for one

moment that he will take an unbusiness-like step in any matter of importance.

When the Senator from Maine made his opening speech, he said that—

There are now two freight ships of 20,000 tons each building in American yards—the largest ships ever built in the world—which will come under the provisions of this bill undoubtedly, and ought to come under the provisions of this bill.

I understand that these two ships are being built by Mr. Hill. Now, upon what hypothesis can any man believe that Mr. Hill would have had these immense ships, the largest in the world, built in American shipyards unless he could have them as cheaply built here as anywhere else in the world? And if Mr. Hill is now building these great ships, and intends to build more, many more, without becoming a "bounty beggar," but as a business man and for business reasons, where is the apology for proposing to take the public money and make a free gift of it to him? If we give it to anybody he should have his share with the balance, I suppose; but the honest truth is that none of them should have it. Why should a subsidy be offered to ships? Are freight rates too low? If so, we had best allow foreign ships to continue to carry our commerce for less than it is worth; that is a loss to them and a gain to us.

If freight rates are reasonable and fair, then no inducement should be required to induce ships to engage in the business, and if they are exorbitantly high already, how can we excuse ourselves for taxing the people to swell their profits?

I quote from the RECORD (p. 61), in the opening speech of the Senator from Maine, the following:

On the Atlantic our ships are carrying, or two years ago were carrying, as low as they could profitably; but these rates have increased very largely since the Spanish war.

Mr. HANNA. One hundred per cent.

Here is a statement which certainly no advocate of this bill can challenge: That rates which were profitable two years ago have already been increased "very largely," said Mr. FRYE; "100 per cent," said Mr. HANNA, and yet this bill is to give greater bounties to such a business. How can such gross injustice be excused? Can it be defended? I believe not.

During his speech the Senator from Maine was asked why capital did not go into ships, and he replied: "Because there was more money in other things." It would seem that if this bill passes, that will not be said again. But Mr. Hill has himself recently given utterance to some very interesting statements directly bearing on this question. I quote from the Chicago Chronicle, December 9, 1900:

SUBSIDY WILL BE A HELP.

The capital of the country and the energy of the country must naturally seek other channels, and I know of none so inviting as to make an intelligent and strong effort to carry the flag of the United States onto the high seas, and dominate the high seas, as we certainly can if we are not hampered too much by ill-advised attempts at helping us. We can build ships in this country as well and as cheaply as they can be built anywhere in the world. Now, I have figures within the last year furnished from the best builders on the Clyde, and figures from as good builders as there are in this country, and, to my utter amazement, the American figures on a single ship were from \$400,000 to \$500,000 under the best Clyde builders, and when we get the ship subsidy that is promised how happy we shall be. Unfortunately, the kind of ships that is to receive the subsidy is one that may need it, but it is one that the country at large does not need. I allude to these ocean greyhounds. I believe a subsidy should be based upon an actual commodity, like flour. If the bill passes it will not be the first mistake, and it will not be altogether a loss if it starts the building of a merchant marine under the American flag.

A recent issue of the Chicago Times-Herald says:

James J. Hill, president of the Great Northern Railroad, is of the opinion that American shipping has such a bright immediate future before it that it is bound to increase in extent, with or without Government subsidies, and that in its growth it will vastly extend the possibilities of the American farmer and manufacturers in their efforts to gain foreign markets.

And quotes Mr. Hill as follows:

I do not think that the American people will have as difficult a problem to solve in the ships as they had in the land transportation. I think they will soon find the way to solve it. Capital has but a small field left in railroad extension, and must soon seek other channels. I know of none so inviting as that which leads us to make a strong and intelligent effort to carry the flag of the country into the seas and to dominate the ocean, as we certainly can if not too much hampered by ill-advised attempts at helping us. We can build ships as easily as any nation in the world.

This is not the first experience of this country with subsidies. They have always proved costly failures. The subsidies to the Collins Line and to the Pacific Mail yet linger unpleasantly in the memories of men, while only nine years ago, under the leadership of the Senator from Maine, I believe, Congress passed a mail-subsidy bill, which is now on the statute books, and which I fear will remain there for many years to come, notwithstanding the fact that during this debate the Senator from Maine himself has denounced it, to use his own striking words, as a "dead failure."

Our Government pays, when foreign vessels carry our mails, about 4½ cents per pound for letters and post cards and about 4½ cents per pound for other mail matter, and they seem to be glad to carry them on these terms. When we send the same mails in American ships we pay \$1.60 per pound for letters and post cards and 8 cents per pound for other matter. We thus pay about four

times as much for the same service to American ships in carrying letter mails and twice as much for other mail service as we could have it done for. Not content with this difference in favor of our ships, the act of March 3, 1891, the mail-subsidy act to which I have just alluded, was passed, under which the Postmaster-General is authorized to contract for carrying the mails for terms of not less than five nor more than ten years, for not more than \$4 per mile for first-class ships and \$2 per mile for second-class ships, etc., for the outward voyage in carrying mails.

Let us look at the operation of this law. For the one line carrying mails to Great Britain, under this law the Postmaster-General entered into a contract with the International Navigation Company on October 12, 1895, for a term of ten years, to carry the mails from New York to Southampton, and to receive therefor \$4 per mile on the outward voyage. If the mails carried by this line on this route last year had been carried by foreign ships, this Government would have paid for the service as follows:

160,107 pounds letters and post cards, at 44 cents	\$70,447.08
1,659,766 pounds all other mail matter, at 4½ cents	74,639.47

Total 145,136.55

If this same service had been rendered by an American line, not subsidized, the service would have cost the Government:

160,107 pounds letters and post cards, \$1.60 per pound	\$256,171.20
1,659,766 pounds other mail matter, at 8 cents per pound	132,781.28

Total 388,952.48

Under the contract made under the mail subsidy bill of 1891 we actually paid for this service \$647,278.40, thus paying for a given service \$502,087.85 more than it could have been done for.

And this gross sum was paid for the trips made and absolutely without any reference to the amount of mail carried, and the same amount would have been paid to this company if one-half or one-fourth only of the mail had been carried. The Superintendent of Foreign Mails, in his estimates submitted, recommends that instead of 44 trips, as for last year in this service, there shall be next year 52 trips, which, if adopted, would make this service cost \$757,328.

The bill under which this large amount is paid was, among other things, called "An act to promote commerce." If there was any excuse for its enactment, it was the hope of promoting our commerce by the building of American ships. What is the result? This act has been in force nine years, and during this debate the Senator from Maine pronounced it, in so far as it had effected the decadence of American shipping, to use his own words, "a dead failure." As a means of building up American shipping it is a failure, "a dead failure," but as a means of looting the Treasury it is a great success, a shining success.

It took last year out of the Treasury \$647,224.40, for a service which others would have gladly rendered for \$145,136.55—an absolute donation of \$502,087.85, for which the Government and the people secure nothing. And this was absolutely the only effect of the law in this case. It did nothing else; it built no ships; it promoted no commerce; it did nothing except to provide for the enormous sum of money being paid out of the Treasury practically without an equivalent. And if the recommendation of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails shall be adopted, we will next year, and perhaps during the remainder of this contract, pay to these ships \$757,000 annually. Is there now any pretense that the people are getting any benefit whatever from this law?

Take another instance of the operation of the subsidy law we already have. In route No. 74, from Boston and Philadelphia to Port Antonio, Jamaica, there were last year, under a contract made in January, 1899, and to continue for ten years, 102 trips. There were carried in all these 102 trips 2,328 pounds of letters and post cards and 36,144 pounds of other mail matter—less than 23 pounds of letters and post cards for each trip of these steamships, and about 355 pounds of paper, etc. This service would have cost in foreign ships:

2,328 pounds, at 44 cents	\$980.32
36,144 pounds, at 4½ cents	1,625.98

Total 2,606.30

Or, at the rate paid to American ships, this service would have cost:

2,328 pounds letters and post cards, at \$1.60 per pound	\$3,544.80
36,144 pounds other mail matter, at 8 cents per pound	2,891.52

Total 6,436.32

While the Government under the contract made under this law of 1891, and to continue for eight years longer, actually paid \$121,255.34, a bonus above what the service was actually worth of \$118,649.04 on a service worth \$2,606.30. If such a transaction could be had between two individuals, one of them would be considered an idiot and the other little better than a highwayman.

There are a number of other lines having these contracts. There is no limit to the law, and they will doubtless increase until the public shall tire of this unpardonable waste of the public

funds and compel the repeal of the law. Will this time ever come? But I will not weary the Senate with further details.

When the system of making these large donations to these steamship companies without consideration is known to be a "dead failure," so far as any public purpose is concerned, it would seem that the law of 1891 should not longer remain on the statute books. But instead of proposing to repeal this law, this "dead failure," this worse than useless statute, we are engaged in undertaking to enact another law which will prove infinitely worse in every respect, and in explanation of exactly what this bill means and is intended by its friends to mean I wish to call attention to a recent letter from the Senator from Maine to Hon. Whitelaw Reid, of the New York Tribune, from which it will clearly be seen that these outrageous contributions for the ship companies are not enough, in the opinion of the Senator from Maine and that the real purpose of this bill is to raise these outrages exactly 50 per cent.

I quote from the New York Press of January 15, 1901:

THE SUBSIDY SECRET OUT.

Mr. Whitelaw Reid is to be congratulated on having elicited from the advocates of the ship-subsidy bill the information which all the maritime and political world was after. Thanks to a personal letter from Senator FRYE, in response to a personal inquiry of the editor of the Tribune, we have the reason why this measure, designed as it is to foster the carriage of American freight in American cargo boats, should be handicapped with a provision for an abnormal increase in the postal rates of four American mail boats. This is it:

"The rate of \$6 per mile was that proposed by the postal subsidy bill of 1891 as passed by the Senate. When the House returned the bill with that rate reduced to \$4 I was disposed to abandon the bill altogether, as I was convinced that it would prove a failure. Against my own judgment I accepted it, and the next year, as you will recall, we were compelled to pass an act admitting the *Paris* and the *New York* in order to give any vitality whatever to the postal subsidy bill of 1891.

"Since 1894-95 the American Line has been running without paying any dividends, as our committee has been repeatedly assured by Mr. Griscom. The pending subsidy bill in effect restores the rate of \$6, which will suffice to enable the company to pay on those ships a dividend of about 3½ per cent."

Here we have it. The increased mail pay of half a million is saddled on the bill to enable the American Line to pay dividends. Well and good if the American Line can show that its failure to pay dividends is due to the extra cost of running a ship on the American standard. Not well and not good if that failure is found to be due to the fact that since 1894-95 the American Line has virtually dropped out of the race for ocean supremacy, that it has not raised a finger to meet the efforts of its rivals in the building of *Campanias*, *Kaiser Wilhelms*, *Deutschlands*, and *Oceanics*. And until the American Line has demonstrated to a committee of Congress that its losses are to be charged, not to false economies or other bad management—such, for instance, as plumping one of its four vessels ashore at Long Branch and the other on the Manacles—rather than to high costs, it can lay no claim to an increase of one penny of its mail pay. To figure up a 3½ per cent dividend on a steamship company's capital stock and ask Congress to appropriate, without investigation, the money to pay it is a form of lousy beggary to which even the Coxey army never attained in a not dissimilar trip to the steps of the Capitol.

But is it possible that Senators FRYE and HANNA will delay the passage of this bill and thereby endanger if not defeat its great purpose of "the profitable employment of the surplus productive power of the farms, factories, mines, forests, and fisheries of the United States" while Congress is going over the accounts of a single mail contractor? If so, we shall know finally, unanswerably, incontrovertibly, that the main purpose of the measure is not, as its title indicates, "to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States," but to enable "eight gentlemen" to meet and declare to themselves out of the proceeds of an appropriation bill a dividend of 3½ per cent on an unprofitable investment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 3, on page 9, line 25, before the word "years," strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. BERRY. I should like to hear the effect of that amendment from the proposer of it. The Senator from Rhode Island said that he intended to explain the amendment.

Mr. FRYE. He will be in in a moment.

Mr. LODGE. He will be here in a moment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Maine asked unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill should be dispensed with, but the reading of the bill for purposes of amendment was just begun, I think, when the debate commenced, and the bill has not been read for amendment.

Mr. FRYE. It has been amended; but what the Senator says is true—that the bill was not read.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is my recollection.

Mr. FRYE. The amendments were simply acted upon.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then I think the bill should be read at length, so as to give all Senators an opportunity to offer any amendments they choose, or to see the effect of amendments offered.

Mr. FRYE. It would be an excellent thing for Senators who have made speeches against the bill if they had seen what effect the amendments had upon it. I think it would have changed their speeches to a very large extent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have endeavored to keep up with the kaleidoscopic changes of the bill. I know when it was first reported here about a year ago it was totally different from what it

is now. I know it is totally different now from what was reported by the committee a month ago. It is hard for a man to keep up from one day to another with the changes that are occurring in the bill, and the Senator ought not to expect a man who is not an expert and who is on the outside to keep up with changes that are so rapid.

Mr. FRYE. But I notice that the speeches of the New York Reform Club, which were directed against what was called the Hanna bill of about two years ago, have practically been repeated in the United States Senate against what is now called the Frye bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. And this is practically the Hanna bill.

Mr. FRYE. It is very different from the Hanna bill. There is hardly a resemblance between the two bills. In the first place, when the Hanna bill was presented to the Committee on Commerce two years ago and over it was changed very materially, and when it was presented to the Committee on Commerce by me at the last session of Congress it was changed still more, and more materially, too; and it has since received other changes. Take the speeches so far as I have heard them—I am not now speaking of the speech of the Senator from Arkansas, but take the speech of the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], and it was actually amusing. I sat as long as I could, and the temptation to interrupt was so great that I finally left, for I do not like to interrupt Senators when they are making speeches. I do not think it is good form, and I do not like to do it. I like to have a Senator make his speech as he pleases to make it. But the application of the speech of the Senator from Washington to the pending bill was something so remote that I could not by possibility see it; and the figures that were given were figures that had no application whatever to the pending bill.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Maine whether he agrees that the bill ought to be read at this time?

Mr. FRYE. I do agree that it has not been read.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator from Arkansas insist on its being read?

Mr. FRYE. The formal reading of the bill was kindly, by the Senate, dispensed with in order that it might be read for amendment, but instead of reading the bill for amendment the Senate permitted me to go on and have my amendments acted upon without reading the bill; so that if any Senator makes a demand for the reading of the bill, I certainly shall think he has a right to have it read.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill may be dispensed with—

Mr. DANIEL. I object.

Mr. CHANDLER. And that it may be considered as still open to amendment as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BERRY. Objection is made.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Maine a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has asked that the reading be dispensed with, and objection is made.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Maine a question about the bill, for information.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks for the reading of the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Maine whether his speech, which was delivered in the Senate here and which was so interesting and so laborious, was delivered upon the bill as it now stands, or was it delivered upon the bill as reported from the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. FRYE. It was very largely delivered upon the bill as reported by the Committee on Commerce. Those facts I knew all about. Of course, I did not, when I made my speech, have any knowledge of the amendments which have since been offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. MORGAN. I have been looking and listening and reading and working here trying to find out what was before us and what would be before us on this bill, and it has been a fox hunt. This matter has changed so frequently in and out that I have not been able to keep up with it. I therefore think that the Senator from Maine ought now to make his speech over with modifications.

Mr. FRYE. It does not require any modifications.

Mr. CHANDLER. I call for the reading of the bill.

Mr. FRYE. My speech was confined to facts, not fancies.

Mr. MORGAN. Not to the facts in the bill.

Mr. FRYE. Yes; to the facts in the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thought I had the floor when the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Maine began their colloquy.

Mr. MORGAN. Did the Senator from New Hampshire have the floor?

Mr. CHANDLER. I thought I had it.

Mr. MORGAN. I beg pardon of the Senator. I want to yield every moment to him to which he is entitled, because I know how much more interesting he is than anybody else.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is very kind, and I hope he will stay here for a thousand years. [Laughter.] I ask for the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding of the Chair is that the bill is to be read, and amendments of the committee acted upon as they are reached.

Mr. FRYE. The amendments of the committee have already been acted upon, and all have been agreed to. It is simply a requirement to read the bill as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attention of the Senator from New Hampshire is requested. Will he state how he desires the reading of the bill to proceed?

Mr. CHANDLER. The chairman of the committee has stated that the committee amendments to the bill have been adopted. Now, as I understand the order, we can go on with this bill regularly. It must be read; and that form I intend to have complied with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the bill has been amended?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly. That is what the rule would require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill. The Chair understands that the bill as now read will be the original text of the bill as amended upon the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to offer certain amendments to the pending bill. I ask that they be printed and lie on the table until they are reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and laid on the table. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill (S. 727) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary, and read to line 6 on page 3.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know what the order of business is, but, if in order, I move to strike out the word "twenty," on page 3, line 6, and insert the word "fifteen."

Mr. CHANDLER. I object to amendments until the bill is read through.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not know under what order the Senate was proceeding. I understood the bill was being read for amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. No; it is being read according to the rule. Mr. SPOONER. The Senate, by unanimous consent, dispensed with the first formal reading.

Mr. CHANDLER. I asked that, by unanimous consent, the reading of the bill be dispensed with. Objection was made, and now the bill is being read through.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood it had been read heretofore—

Mr. BERRY. It never has been.

Mr. ALDRICH. And amendments are certainly in order.

Mr. CHANDLER. No; not until the bill is read through.

Mr. NELSON. The status is this: The bill has been once read and amendments made to it. At the request of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] the first reading of the bill, which was required by parliamentary rule, was dispensed with, and it was simply read for committee amendments. Now, this reading is made the first reading.

Mr. BERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon; the bill was not read. The first reading of the bill was by unanimous consent waived.

Mr. NELSON. I mean it has been read for amendment.

Mr. BERRY. It has not been read at all for any purpose.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then we have been making amendments to a bill which has not been read.

Mr. BERRY. That is what we have been doing.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is very extraordinary.

Mr. BERRY. It is extraordinary, but that is the fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] asked for the reading of the bill as it has been amended on the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. That was ordered by the Senate, and the reading is now progressing under that order.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 3, page 9, line 25, strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen;" so as to read:

Sec. 3. That in no case shall the same vessel be entitled to any compensation pursuant to this act for a greater period than fifteen years.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Rhode Island stated that he would explain the amendment to the Senate. I do not see him in his seat. It is almost 6 o'clock. The amendment has been or-

dered to be printed, and I think it would be better not to take a vote to-night.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me for a moment? I have sent for the Senator from Rhode Island. If he will offer the other amendments, so that we can have them printed, then there will be no objection to an executive session.

Mr. BERRY. I have no objection to that. I simply think that a vote ought not to be taken until there has been some explanation of what the amendment means.

Mr. CHANDLER. There will be no vote taken to-night, I will say to the Senator. If he will allow the other amendments to be offered—

Mr. FRYE. Does the Senator from Arkansas find any difficulty in understanding what that means—striking out "twenty" and inserting "fifteen?"

Mr. BERRY. I heard the Senator from Maine say in open Senate that the bill was absolutely perfect.

Mr. FRYE. It is getting to be very rapidly.

Mr. BERRY. And I have heard him say several times that more time has been expended on this than on any other bill; that it has been discussed in all its phases; and since then it has been changed more than once. Therefore I will say to him that I would rather see just what the last change is before we act upon it.

Mr. FRYE. Innocence!

FISH-CULTURAL STATION IN IDAHO.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 5534) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Idaho. It is a very short bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPOONER. Is this proceeding with the consent of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Maine is in charge of the bill.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not know.

Mr. CHANDLER. No objection was made when the Senator from Idaho made the request.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from New Hampshire took charge of the bill a few moments ago.

Mr. SPOONER. I thought so. Has the Senator from Maine relinquished it?

Mr. CHANDLER. It occurred to me that it needed to be in charge of some one.

Mr. FRYE. I am always ready to surrender anything to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is no objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho, including purchase of site, construction of buildings and ponds, and equipment, at some suitable point to be selected by the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FISH-CULTURAL STATION IN INDIANA.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3353) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Indiana.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Fisheries with an amendment, in line 3 to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifteen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Indiana, including purchase of site, construction of buildings and ponds, and equipment, at some suitable point to be selected by the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERIE PRESERVING COMPANY.

Mr. BARD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10700) to confirm a lease with the Seneca Nation of Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask the Senator from California for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BARD. It is a short bill, reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with a report. I ask that the report may be read for the explanation.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TILLMAN. I dislike to obstruct the passage of any bill, but I want the Senate to adjourn, and I will not allow any more bills to come up.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to ratify and confirm a lease given by Charles Dennis, a Seneca Indian, to the Erie Preserving Company, as a site for a manufacturing plant, of a certain piece of land near the village of Irving, N. Y.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I want to know about this before I agree to its passage.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BATE. I hope the Senator will withdraw the motion for just a moment, if he pleases, so that a little local matter may be presented.

Mr. CHANDLER. I can not withdraw it in favor of any bill about which there will be debate.

Mr. BATE. There will be no debate and no objection.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I want to know what the bill is.

Mr. BARD. Let the report be read.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask that the report be read.

Mr. BARD. The report explains the bill. It is a very simple matter.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am suspicious of leases with regard to the Seneca Nation. Generally they have been against the interests of the Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BATE. The Senator withdraws the motion to let me present this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire withdraw the motion for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Tennessee to present a bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the bill presented by the Senator from California can be disposed of, I will yield.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Let the report accompanying the bill called up by the Senator from California be read. It is only a few lines long. I want to know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire consent?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not consent to debate upon any bill.

Mr. BATE. There will be no debate.

Mr. TILLMAN. We can take up these bills in the morning hour.

Mr. BATE. No, we can not.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is time to adjourn. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from South Carolina withdraw that motion so that we can have an executive session?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is time to go to dinner. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from South Carolina takes precedence. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 31, 1901, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 30, 1901.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONTESTED ELECTION—WALKER VS. RHEA.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I present a report from the Committee on Elections No. 1 in the case of James A. Walker vs. William F. Rhea, of Virginia, and ask that it be read for present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

Your committee, to whom was referred the contested-election case of James A. Walker vs. William F. Rhea, from the Ninth Congressional district of the State of Virginia, report as follows:

At the regular election held in November, 1898, the candidates for Repre-

sentative in Congress received, according to the official returns, the following votes:

County.	William F. Rhea.	James A. Walker.	Thaddeus E. Harris.	John William Watkins.	John W. Watkins.
Bland	440	450			
Buchanan	543	539			
Craig	459	174	1		
Dickenson	542	578			
Giles	1,130	583	1	2	
Lee	1,317	1,160		5	
Pulaski	1,108	1,009	10	3	
Russell	1,724	1,346		6	
Scott	1,975	1,708	1		5
Smyth	1,412	1,392	1	2	
Tazewell	1,293	2,109	26	5	
Washington	1,000	2,344	3	4	
Wise	998	1,129	5	2	
Wythe	1,767	1,665	2		
Bristol (city)	676	109	2	1	
Total	17,344	16,595	52	30	5

The population of the district as shown by the census of 1890 was as follows:

County.	White.	Colored.	Total.
Bland	4,188	241	4,429
Buchanan	5,843	24	5,867
Craig	3,686	149	3,835
Dickenson	5,051	25	5,077
Giles	8,253	837	9,090
Lee	17,062	1,215	18,275
Pulaski	9,699	3,120	12,819
Russell	14,923	1,203	16,126
Scott	23,726	968	24,694
Smyth	12,136	1,224	13,360
Washington	25,147	2,864	28,011
Bristol (city)	2,068	834	2,902
Tazewell	14,582	2,304	16,886
Pocahontas (city)	1,813	1,140	2,953
Wise	8,763	582	9,345
Wythe	14,849	3,170	18,019
Total	166,699	20,059	186,758

The printed testimony in the case comprised about 3,000 pages and brought in vast detail before the committee the evidence relating to the charges of the contestant and the countercharges of contestee.

The case was most elaborately and ably argued for about two weeks before the committee, and was then considered for many weeks with the greatest care.

The conclusions arrived at as a consequence of the committee's investigation is that while the evidence shows that there were frauds and irregularities practiced, chiefly in the interest of the contestee, they fall very far short of being sufficient to justify a change in the result of the election.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was impossible to hear the conclusion of this report.

Mr. SLAYDEN. We would like to know what resolutions the committee have adopted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will direct the resolutions to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That James A. Walker was not elected a Representative to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the Ninth district of Virginia.

Resolved, That William F. Rhea was duly elected a Representative to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the Ninth district of Virginia, and is entitled to retain his seat therein.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague on the committee, Mr. LINNEY, of North Carolina, desires, as I understand it, to submit the views of the minority. He is not present this morning, and I do not feel as if I ought to press for the consideration of the resolutions in his absence.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit me to say, the gentleman from North Carolina came into the Hall with myself about six minutes ago.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I have not been able to find him, although I have made search. Of course, so far as we are concerned, we do not wish to take any action in his absence.

The SPEAKER. Then, without objection, the consideration of the resolutions will lie over to be called up at another time.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. And in the same connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority of the committee have the right to file their views within such time as they may think necessary.

The SPEAKER. Not to interfere with the disposition of the resolutions of the committee?

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Not at all.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman from Ohio has suggested any time within which the views of the minority may be filed, or does he wish to limit them in that regard?

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I have no wish as to time whatever.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the minority of the committee have leave to file their views in such time as they think necessary?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The resolution submitted by the committee will stand over for the present, to be called up hereafter.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The Clerk will read the first paragraph of the amendment offered last evening by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do I understand that this is the proposed substitute for the portion of the bill which was stricken out?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first paragraph of the amendment that was offered, which will be found on page 1791 of the RECORD.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say for the information of the committee that members will find these paragraphs on page 1791 of this morning's RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 5, page 14, the following:

"Division of Vegetable Physiology and Pathology (salaries): One pathologist, who shall be chief of division, \$2,500; assistant pathologist, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$1,800; assistant pathologist, \$1,200; one clerk, \$1,000; in all, \$6,500.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection this paragraph will be considered as agreed to as a provision of the bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses of Division of Vegetable Physiology and Pathology: vegetable pathological and physiological investigations; investigating the nature of diseases injurious to fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton, vegetables, and other useful plants; experiments in the treatment of the same; the study of plant physiology in relation to crop production and the improvement of crops by breeding and selection; to investigate the diseases affecting citrus fruits, pineapples, and truck crops grown during the winter in the Southern States; to investigate and report upon the diseases affecting plants on the Pacific coast; to originate or introduce improved varieties of fruits and vegetables in cooperation with the Section of Seed and Plant Introduction; to study the relation of soil and climatic conditions to diseases of plants, particularly with reference to the California vine diseases and the diseases of the sugar beet, in cooperation with the Division of Soils, and for other purposes connected with the discovery and practical application of improved methods of crop production; to continue the work of originating, by breeding and selection, in cooperation with the other divisions of the Department and the experiment stations, new varieties of oranges, lemons, and other tropical and subtropical fruits more resistant to cold and disease, and of better quality; varieties of wheat and other cereals more resistant to rust and smut and better suited to the various sections of this country; varieties of cotton more resistant to disease and of longer and better staple, and varieties of pears and apples more resistant to blight and better adapted for export; the employment of investigators, local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and student scientific aids at an annual salary of \$480 each, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; for gas and electric current; purchase of chemicals and apparatus required in the field and laboratory; necessary traveling expenses; the preparation of reports and illustrations; the rent of a building, not to exceed \$1,400 per annum; and for other expenses connected with the practical work of the investigations, \$40,000. In all, for Division of Vegetable Physiology and Pathology, \$46,500.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Pomology (salaries): One pomologist, who shall be Chief of Division, \$2,500; 1 assistant pomologist, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$1,800; 1 clerk class 3, \$1,000; 1 clerk class 1, \$1,200; 1 clerk, \$1,000; 1 clerk, \$840; in all, \$8,940.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BROSIUS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5326. An act granting a pension to Maggie Alice Brady.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3890) granting an increase of pension to Americans V. Rice.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 12904) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 9928) granting an increase of pension to H. S. Reed, alias Daniel Hull, had agreed to the request for a conference with the House on the bill and amendment, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. KYLE, and Mr. TURNER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

Resolved by the House (the Senate concurring). That the President is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 5048) entitled "A bill to confirm in trust to the city of Albuquerque, in the Territory of New Mexico, the town of Albuquerque grant, and for other purposes."

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Division of Pomology: pomological investigations; investigating, collecting, and disseminating information relating to the fruit industry; the collection and distribution of seeds, shrubs, trees, and specimens; and for collecting and modeling fruits, vegetables, and other plants, and furnishing duplicate models to the experiment stations of the various States as far as found practicable; the employment of investigators, local and special agents, clerks, assistants, student scientific aids at an annual salary of \$480 each, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; for traveling and other necessary expenses; to continue the investigations and experiments in the introduction of the culture of European table grapes in the South Atlantic States, and the study of the diseases that affect them, for the purpose of discovering remedies therefor, this work to be done in cooperation with the section of seed and plant introduction; to investigate in cooperation with the other divisions of the Department and experiment stations of the several States the market conditions affecting the fruit trade in the United States and foreign countries, and the methods of harvesting, packing, storing, and shipping fruit, and for experimental shipments of fruits to foreign countries, for the purpose of increasing the exportation of American fruits, and for all necessary expenses connected with the practical work of the same; to investigate, map, and report upon the commercial fruit districts of the United States, for the purpose of determining the relative adaptability of the several important fruits thereto, by a study of the conditions of soil and climate, and of the prevalence of plant diseases existing therein as related to commercial fruit production, \$15,000; in all, for the Division of Pomology, \$23,940.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of this committee if the section which has just been read is intended to cover the investigation of diseases peculiar to all kinds of fruit trees?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. My country is very much interested in peach culture. This gives authority to investigate those things peculiar to that fruit, does it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under the general power given by this bill the scientists of the Department have the right and are practically directed to look after all contagious diseases of fruit trees and plants throughout the whole country. They are not confined to one section nor are they confined to one disease. They have general powers to investigate them all and to find cures for them.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Botany (salaries): One botanist, who shall be chief of division, \$2,500; assistant botanist, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$1,800; assistant botanist, \$1,600; assistant botanist, \$1,400; 1 assistant botanist, \$1,300; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each, \$3,000; 1 clerk, \$900; 2 clerks, at \$840 each, \$1,680; in all, \$13,080.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if there are any additions or increases of service in these respective divisions over the bill of last year?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no statutory increase at all in salaries. There is some increase in the lump sum of the appropriation. What item does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. CORLISS. What item has been increased?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman will see that stated in the report. The increases are for vegetable pathological physiological investigations, \$12,000; for botanical investigations and experiments, \$10,000; for pomological investigations, \$5,500.

Mr. CORLISS. Are those the only increases you have made in these divisions?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. CORLISS. And you have restored the divisions to the condition in which they were before?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment as read will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses of Division of Botany: botanical investigations and experiments; investigations relating to medicinal, poisonous, fiber, and other economic plants, seeds, and weeds; the collection of plants, traveling expenses, and express charges; the purchase of paper and all other necessary supplies, materials, and apparatus; for gas and electric current; for the employment of investigators, local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and student scientific aids at an annual salary of \$480 each, and other labor in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; subscriptions to and purchase of botanical publications for use in the

division; and the preparation, illustration, and publication of reports; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to purchase samples of seeds in open market, test same, and when found not up to standard he may, at his discretion, publish the results of such of these tests, together with the names of the seedsmen by whom the seeds were sold; to investigate and publish reports upon the useful plants and plant cultures of the tropical territory of the United States, and to investigate, report upon, and introduce other plants promising to be valuable for the tropical territory of the United States, such plants and botanical and agricultural information when secured to be made available for the work of agricultural experiment stations and schools; to investigate the varieties of wheat and other cereals grown in the United States or suitable for introduction, in order to standardize the naming of varieties as a basis for the experimental work of the State experiment stations and as an assistance in commercial grading, and to investigate, in cooperation with the Bureau of Chemistry, the causes of deterioration of export grain, particularly in oceanic transit, and devise means of preventing losses from those causes, \$40,000; in all, for Division of Botany, \$53,080.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Agrostology (salaries): One agrostologist, who shall be chief of division, \$2,500; 1 assistant chief, \$1,800; 1 assistant, \$1,500; 1 assistant, \$1,400; 1 histologist, \$900; in all, \$8,100.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Division of Agrostology; grass and forage plant investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of grasses, forage plants, and animal foods in cooperation with other divisions of the Department; to collect and purchase seeds, roots, and specimens of valuable economic grasses and forage plants for investigation, experimental cultivation, and distribution, and for experiments and reports upon the best methods of extirpating Johnson and other noxious and destructive grasses; to purchase tools, materials, apparatus, and supplies; to pay freight, express charges, and traveling expenses; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and scientific student aids at an annual salary of \$480 each, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to prepare drawings and illustrations for circulars, reports, and bulletins; and the agricultural experiment stations are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in establishing and maintaining experimental grass stations, for determining the best methods of caring for and improving meadows and grazing lands, the use of different grasses and forage plants, and their adaptability to various soils and climates, the best native and foreign species for reclaiming overstocked ranges and pastures, for renovating worn-out lands, for binding drifting sands and washed lands, and for turfing lawns and pleasure grounds, and for solving the various forage problems presented in the several sections of our country, \$20,000: *Provided*, That \$6,000 of the amount hereby appropriated be used to purchase and collect seeds, roots, and specimens of valuable and economic grasses and forage plants, to be distributed to the various experiment stations in the several States and Territories, to be by them used, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, to ascertain their adaptability to the various soils and climates of the United States: *And provided further*, That not more than \$6,000 of the amount hereby appropriated shall be expended for salaries in the city of Washington, D. C.: *Provided*, That \$5,000 of this sum, or such part thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, to be immediately available; in all, for the Division of Agrostology, \$28,100.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Forestry (salaries): One forester, who shall be chief of division, \$2,500; 1 superintendent of working plans, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$1,800; 1 clerk class 2, \$1,400; 1 clerk class 1, \$1,200; 1 clerk, \$900; 1 clerk, \$720; in all, \$8,520.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Division of Forestry: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, forest reserves, forest fires, and lumbering; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to collect and distribute valuable economic forest tree seeds and plants; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments and investigations in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and for collating, digesting, reporting, illustrating, and printing the results of such experiments and investigations; for the purchase of all necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures; for freight and express charges, and traveling expenses, \$179,000, of which sum not to exceed \$2,000 may be used for the payment of rent. In all, for the Division of Forestry, \$187,520.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee what is the necessity of devolving the duty upon the Agricultural Department of investigating forest fires when we already have that subject, if not fully, at least in part, considered and regulated by the Interior Department?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That not only refers to the forest reserves, but to forests generally.

Mr. KING. Is the other not included in their work?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is some duplication of work in them, as I stated to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody], and undoubtedly these two divisions' work ought to be combined under one head. I will say to the gentleman from Utah that both Secretaries are in favor of forming one bureau, and that

was intended in the legislation that the gentleman from Pennsylvania struck out on a point of order.

Mr. KING. It is very unfortunate that that union could not have been effected, because it is evident, in view of the fact that most of the forests are now found upon the public lands, within the forest reserves, that if they are cared for at all they ought to be cared for by one Department; and the Agricultural Department, in attempting to prevent forest fires, must of necessity have to do with the forest reserves, which is a clear duplication of labor. It seems to me very unfortunate that there could not have been such legislation as the gentleman suggested.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think so myself. I will say to the gentleman I am heartily in favor of it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think this provision in the bill is an entirely proper one. I do not agree with the view of the gentleman from Utah that all of the expenditures in connection with forest reserves should be carried in one bill, and all forest-reserve work be under the control of one Department of the Government. I certainly can not agree with the view that the Department of Agriculture should have full charge of and supervision over the forest reserves. I do believe, however, that certain classes of work and investigation relating to forests, in forest reserves as well as on the public domain, should be under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. Hence I favor this appropriation.

For the present, at least, the management and control of forest reserves must remain with the Department of the Interior, for in the first instance the lands embraced in forest reserves are principally public lands, and a great proportion of the questions of management and control of the reserves are directly or indirectly public-land questions. The forest reserves are open to exploration and entry under the mining laws. Settlers within the boundaries of forest reserves are entitled to lien lands for the lands they own or claim within the reserves at the time they are established. The right to the use of timber growing on the forest reserves is granted to settlers residing in the vicinity, under certain conditions. Manifestly the settlement of the question arising under these conditions and provisions of law properly belongs with the Department of the Interior, the Department which has to do with the public lands, and has a thoroughly trained and equipped force to handle the legal and administrative questions which are constantly arising thereunder.

On the other hand, the Department of Agriculture is the proper branch of the Government service to take up and carry on the study, investigation, and demonstration of the questions relating to forest growth and the reforestation of denuded areas both within and without the forest reserves.

Each Department carries on its own proper work without conflicting with or duplicating the work of the other. There need be no conflict between the two Departments. In fact, I understand there is none, for I understand there is a full understanding between the two Departments as to the sphere of each and cordial cooperation in mutual effort.

Some time in the future, when the purely public land and legal questions are largely eliminated from the reserves, it may be possible to merge the management of the reserves and the study and investigations relating to them under one Department. For the present this is impracticable. The Interior Department should continue the management and policing of the reserves, the Agricultural Department investigating and advising on questions of forestry promotion, protection, and extension.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend—I have not the paper before me and can not give the line—by striking out "one hundred," leaving the appropriation \$87,000. I find by an examination of the last act—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend until the Clerk reports the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "one hundred;" so that the appropriation shall read "\$87,520."

Mr. CORLISS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do that for this reason: I find in the last appropriation bill that the entire appropriation for this branch of the service was only \$80,000—on page 8—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Eighty-eight thousand.

Mr. CORLISS. Eighty-eight thousand it is. Now, this one division has increased \$100,000 in a lump sum for forestry investigation. I submit that argument is not necessary. There can be no possible demand in that division for an increase of \$100,000 in one year. I ask for a vote.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, no country in the whole world has taken up the study of forestry or, if I may use the term, the rehabilitation of its forest lands until it was threatened with the exhaustion of the lumber and wood supply. This country has reached that point now, and the work of the Forestry Division is undoubtedly most important to the lumber and wood interests

of this country. I will read now what the Secretary of Agriculture says on that subject in his own language:

THE DEMANDS UPON THE DIVISION.

The insistent demand for the services of the Division of Forestry is the most conspicuous fact to be noted here, and the inability of the forester, through lack of resources, to meet these demands is perhaps the most serious of all hindrances to the progress of practical forestry in this country. Public interest in forest matters is just now not only keener and wider than at any time heretofore, but it is growing with a rapidity altogether without precedent. To fail to use this unequalled opportunity for the protection and preservation of our forests would, I believe, be of the nature of a real misfortune.

Until the past year the requests which came to this Department for working plans originated altogether from private sources, and they were, as I have said, far more numerous than the resources of the Division of Forestry could meet. During the past year not only have the requests from private owners of forest lands continued in undiminished number, but the work of the division in this direction has been recognized by official requests, covering enormous areas of forest land. The most important of these came from the Secretary of the Interior, in the form of an application for working plans for the whole area of the national forest reserves. This first step toward the introduction of the principles of forestry on Government forest land was heartily seconded by this Department, and in spite of the fact that the Department of the Interior was unable to bear any share of the expenses, preliminary examinations of several reserves were undertaken, and the preparation of a working plan for the Black Hills Forest Reserve was begun in the very early spring. This working plan was pushed forward vigorously during the summer, completed as to field work in the late autumn, and will be entirely finished during the coming winter. It will give complete and explicit directions for the harvesting of the forest crop in the Black Hills in such a way as to perpetuate the supply of native timber, without which the enormous mining interests of this section must suffer most severely.

The estimate from the Secretary of Agriculture has been granted by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PEARSON. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he would not be willing to incorporate just there the Secretary's letter to the President in regard to the southern Appalachian Forest Reserve? It is directly in point and in support of the gentleman's argument.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not seen it.

Mr. PEARSON. It has not been published, but it is a valuable contribution to the literature on the subject.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Have you the letter?

Mr. PEARSON. Yes, I have; and I will furnish it to the gentleman.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the gentleman will pass it to me, I will glance over it and then ask unanimous consent that it may be printed.

Mr. PEARSON. Very well. I only want it to go into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the committee will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

Division of Chemistry (salaries): One chemist, who shall be Chief of Division, \$2,500; 1 assistant chemist, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$1,800; 1 assistant chemist, \$1,000; 1 clerk class 1, \$1,200; in all, \$7,100.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

General expenses, Division of Chemistry: Chemical apparatus, chemicals, laboratory fixtures and supplies, repairs to engine and apparatus; gas and electric current, purchase of supplies and necessary expenses in conducting special investigations, including necessary traveling and other expenses, labor and expert work in such investigations, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; for the employment of additional assistant chemists, when necessary, and for employment of not to exceed four laborers in Division of Chemistry, when necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

To investigate the adulteration of foods, drugs, and liquors, when deemed by the Secretary of Agriculture advisable; and the Secretary of Agriculture, whenever he has reason to believe that articles are being imported from foreign countries which are dangerous to the health of the people of the United States, shall make a request upon the Secretary of the Treasury for samples from original packages of such articles for inspection and analysis; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to open such original packages and deliver specimens to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose mentioned, giving notice to the owner or consignee of such articles, who may be present and have the right to introduce testimony; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall refuse delivery to the consignee of any such goods which the Secretary of Agriculture reports to him have been inspected and analyzed and found to be dangerous to health.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the character of proposed food preservatives and coloring matters, to determine their relation to digestion and to health, and to establish the principles which should guide their use; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the character of the chemical and physical tests which are applied to American food products in foreign countries, and to inspect before shipment, when desired

by the shippers or owners of these food products, American food products intended for countries where chemical and physical tests are required before said food products are allowed to be sold in the countries mentioned, and for all necessary expenses connected with such inspection and studies of methods of analysis in foreign countries; for the preparation of reports, the purchase of apparatus, chemicals, samples, and supplies required in conducting such investigations, the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting such experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; for freight and express charges, and for traveling and other necessary expenses, \$24,500, of which sum \$2,500 may be used for the rent of a laboratory building; in all, for the Division of Chemistry, \$31,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the next amendment, as follows:

Division of Soils (salaries): One chief, \$2,500; 1 assistant chief, \$1,800; 1 assistant, \$1,000; 1 clerk, \$1,000; in all, \$6,300.

General expenses, Division of Soils: Investigation of the relation of soils to climate and organic life; for the investigation of the texture and composition of soils in the field and laboratory; for the investigation of the cause and prevention of the rise of alkali in the soils of the irrigated districts; the investigation of the relation of soils to drainage and seepage waters, and of methods for the prevention of the accumulation of and injury from seepage waters in irrigated districts; to map the soils of the United States: *Provided*, That when 50 per cent of the arable soil of any State or Territory in which the work has been done shall have been mapped, no further work is to be done in that State or Territory till the same percentage of soil mapping shall have been accomplished in the other States and Territories of the United States: *Provided further, however*, That not less than one field season's work of one field force shall be done in any State or Territory before leaving that State or Territory; to investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries; to investigate, in cooperation with the Division of Botany, the methods of curing, with particular reference to fermentation; to originate, through selection and breeding, improved varieties for the principle tobacco district of the United States, and to secure, as far as may be, a change in the methods of supplying tobacco to foreign countries; the location of the stations, rent of buildings, not to exceed \$1,400 per annum, for office and laboratory purposes; the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; the preparation of drawings and illustrations; for materials, tools, instruments, apparatus, gas and electric current, supplies, and for traveling expenses, freight and express charges; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue and extend the survey and mapping of agricultural lands, and for all necessary expenses connected with the survey; preparation and printing of reports and illustrations; employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, in collecting, collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such surveys; freight and express charges, and for traveling and other necessary expenses, \$91,000, \$10,000 of which shall be immediately available; in all, for the Division of Soils, \$97,300.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I told the House yesterday that there was no new legislation in these paragraphs. I find on reexamination that we inserted the wrong paragraph, and I desire to offer a substitute for this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil investigations: Investigation of the relation of soils to climate and organic life; for the investigation of the texture and composition of soils in the field and laboratory; for the investigation of the cause and prevention of the rise of alkali in the soils of the irrigated districts; the investigation of the relation of soils to drainage and seepage waters, and of methods for the prevention of the accumulation of and injury from seepage waters in irrigated districts; to map the tobacco soils of the United States; to investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries; to investigate the methods of curing, with particular reference to fermentation; to originate, through selection and breeding, improved varieties of the principal tobacco districts of the United States, and to secure, as far as may be, a change in the methods of supplying tobacco to foreign countries; the location of the stations, and the rent of a building, not to exceed \$900 per annum, for office and laboratory purposes; the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; the preparation of drawings and illustrations; for materials, tools, instruments, apparatus, gas and electric current, supplies, and for traveling expenses, freight and express charges, \$25,000, of which sum \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of demonstrating the practical value of underdrainage and other methods of reclaiming alkali lands.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This substitute is an exact copy of the bill of last year.

Mr. CORLISS. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is the same appropriation as was carried last year?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The exact figures of last year's appropriation.

Mr. CORLISS. And the gentleman offers it as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands it.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment as amended will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether the original recommendation of the committee this year did not carry ninety-odd thousand dollars for soil surveys?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It did; but that involved some legislation, and upon a point of order by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] the whole item was stricken out.

Mr. KING. Was the whole of the ninety-odd thousand dollars for soil survey?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was for the work of the division of soils. The larger portion of it would have gone for soil surveys.

Mr. KING. With the adoption of the amendment which the gentleman has just offered, does that reduce the amount devoted to the survey of soils?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does; it gives the same amount we had last year in the bill, and the paragraph has the same legislation as the paragraph of last year.

[Mr. KING addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Ordinarily I am in favor of economy and opposed to large appropriations; but it is to me a singular thing that every other class of citizens in this broad Union of ours can come to this House and get whatever they want in the way of appropriation, but alas, as soon as an appropriation is asked for the benefit of the farming class men arise all over this House and with one accord begin to plead constitutional limits. It is all right as long as a manufacturer wants anything; it is all right as long as trusts and great combinations want anything, or any other class of citizens; but as soon as a small pittance is asked for the benefit of the agricultural industry, why, great, big, bushy-headed statesmen arise all over this Hall and look wise like owls, and say: "It is unconstitutional." [Laughter.] And so it goes. Why, it does not make any difference if you do discriminate in favor of the agricultural industry of this great nation, because upon the prosperity of that industry depends the prosperity of all others.

No nation can be prosperous as long as the agricultural industry is lagging. The farmers are the foundation stone of all prosperity and all happiness and of all greatness. They pay the debts. They pay 80 per cent of the enormous amount of taxes which this House places upon the country? They furnish the men to fight your battles; they furnish that which feeds and clothes your soldiers while they are protecting your homes; and they should be entitled to some consideration. They pay all your debts, figuratively speaking, of all kinds. Look at the farmer as he goes along, day after day, upon his farm. Talk about the heroes of Thermopylae, of Marathon and Salamis; talk about the heroism of Wellington and Napoleon and others! When you come to compare them with the heroism of the one-horse farmer, as he goes on from year to year upon his farm, working with tools upon which he pays 75 per cent tariff, and paying tribute to all classes, he is the hero of this great nation [applause]; and at the end of the year where do you find him? He has not made tongue and buckle meet. He pays all the bills. He goes to the lawyer to pay his fee, and when he goes in the lawyer, of course, will put his hands in his vest and say, "Come in. You are the sturdy yeomanry; you are the bone and sinew of this country; I will take your fee." At the same time saying, "You are the foundation stone and everything," and all the time he is pushing his money down into his pocket. Then the farmer goes to the doctor and says, "I have come to pay your bill." The doctor says, "Well, this has been a hard year. It has been dry. You are the bone and sinew of the country," and all the time he is putting the money down in his pocket while sympathizing with him. The farmer goes to the school-teacher and then he goes to the merchant and pays his bills, and they are all the time saying that he is the bone and sinew of the country, but all the time they are pushing his money down in their pockets. Lastly, he goes to the good old minister, and the good old brother says, "Come in, Deacon, I am glad to see you." He goes in and pays his pastor's salary, and the good old brother, as he pushes it down in his pocket says, "You are the bone and sinew of the country. We hope times will be better next year. If you do not get your reward now, brother, you will surely get it in the sweet by and by." [Laughter.] And so it goes ad infinitum.

I think we ought to have some consideration for this class of citizens, and I am tired of hearing these constitutional objections from these great, big, bushy-headed statesmen. [Laughter.] Whenever there is any fighting to be done, the farmer fights your battles. When the days of riot come in the great cities, when trouble hangs over the land, where do they go except down into the quiet home farms to get men to stop these things? It is there we find that sturdy yeomanry whose virtue and conservatism always correct the vice and corruption so often found in thickly settled and congested city populations.

Long years ago, in the days of '76, when the flag of revolt was flung to the breeze against the black-hearted despotism of Great Britain, where did they go to get a man to lead us out of that? Where did they turn their eyes? Down upon a farm, in his quiet home on the Potomac, they got George Washington, and he saved his country and gave us our present independence. It was done by the farmers, and I want to say that I hope this howling will stop, and not only let us pass this appropriation, but double the amount for bulletins, double the amount for seed [loud applause] and for everything else, and show at once that this House appreciates the support of the farmers, who have the burdens of this

country upon their shoulders and are willing to carry it. [Great applause.]

I hope that amendments will be offered to double the amount for bulletins and seed, and that they will pass, in justice to the class I have thus mentioned. [Applause.]

[Mr. GLYNN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I have here the letter referred to a moment ago in my colloquy with the chairman of the committee. The gentleman from New York consents that it go in as a part of my remarks, instead of a part of his remarks; and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the letter appear as a part of his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he presents a preliminary report of investigations upon the forests of the Southern Appalachian Mountain region. Upon the basis of the facts established by this investigation the Secretary of Agriculture recommends the purchase of land for a national forest reserve in western North Carolina, eastern Tennessee, and adjacent States. I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the reasons upon which this recommendation rests.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, January 16, 1901.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1901.

The PRESIDENT:

The bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, provides that a "sum not to exceed \$5,000 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be used to investigate the forest conditions in the Southern Appalachian Mountain region of western North Carolina and adjacent States." In accordance with this provision I have made a thorough investigation of the forests in a portion of the Southern Appalachian Mountains, as directed above, including an estimate of the amount and condition of the standing timber, an inquiry as to the suitability of this region for a national park, as proposed by the Appalachian National Park Association, and an examination of the validity of the reasons advanced by its advocates for the creation of such a park. In this task I have received generous and effective cooperation and assistance, through the United States Geological Survey, from the Department of the Interior, which recognized in this way the deep and widely diffused public interest in the plan.

The forest investigation was made to include a study of the character and distribution of the species of timber trees, the density and value of forest growth, the extent to which the timber has been cut or damaged by fire, the size and nature of the present holdings, the prices at which these forest lands can now be purchased, and the general and special conditions that affect the prosecution of conservative forestry on a large scale.

The hydrographic survey of the region, conducted by the United States Geological Survey, includes a general study of its topographic features; of the relation of the soils, forest cover, and rainfall; of the quantity of water flowing out of it through the various streams during different seasons, and of the influence exerted on the regularity of this flow by forest clearings. More than 750 stream measurements have already been made, and much additional data of special value has been secured.

In addition to these investigations, I have given thorough attention to the arguments advanced by the movers for the proposed park and to those of their opponents, and, as a result, I am strongly of opinion that this matter is worthy of careful consideration.

I have the honor to transmit herewith a mounted original copy of a large map, which shows in detail the mapping of forests accomplished during the past summer over an area of nearly 8,000 square miles. A full report of the work and of its results is now in preparation and will be submitted for your consideration at an early date. The following preliminary statement is made to bring before you without delay a summary of the facts, sufficient to set forth clearly the principal features of the region and the plan.

The movement for the purchase and control of a large area of forest land in the East by the Government has chiefly contemplated a national park. The idea of a national park is conservation, not use; that of a forest reserve, conservation by use. I have therefore to recommend a forest reserve instead of a park. It is fully shown by the investigation that such a reserve would be self-supporting from the sale of timber under wisely directed conservative forestry.

Extensive areas of hard-wood forests, within the region colored on the accompanying map, are still in their primitive condition, and these are among the very best and richest hard-wood forests of the United States. The region in general is better adapted for forestry than for agricultural purposes. It is located about the head waters of numerous streams, such as the Ohio, Tennessee, Savannah, Yadkin, and Roanoke, which are important both for water-power and for navigation. The general conditions within the region are exceptionally favorable for the carrying on of large operations in practical forestry, and the weather is suitable for lumbering operations at all seasons of the year. It contains a greater variety of hard-wood trees than any other region of the United States, since the northern and southern species here meet. It is a region of exceptional beauty and picturesqueness, and although it would not be easily accessible to visitors in all parts at all seasons of the year, by far the greater portion of its area would be easily reached and climatically pleasant throughout the year.

It contains within the forest-covered areas no large settlements or large mining operations which would interfere with the management of such a forest reserve, and yet there is a sufficient population for the working and protection of the forests. Large lumber companies are rapidly invading the region, and the early destruction of the more valuable timber is imminent. Lands in this region suitable for such a forest reserve are now generally held in large bodies of from 50,000 to 100,000 acres, and they can be purchased at prices ranging from \$2 to \$5 per acre. It is probable that the average price would not exceed \$3 per acre. In explanation of the widespread and urgent demand for the establishment in this southern Appalachian region of a national park or forest reserve, it may be added that it contains the highest and largest mountain masses and perhaps the wildest and most picturesque scenery east of the Mississippi River; that it is a region of perfect healthfulness, already largely used as a health resort both summer and winter, and that it lies within little more than a day's travel of the larger portion of the population of this country.

The rapid consumption of our timber supplies, the extensive destruction of our forests by fire, and the resulting increase in the irregularity of the flow of water in important streams have served to develop among the people of this country an interest in forest problems which is one of the marked features of the close of the century. In response to this growing interest the Government has set aside in the Western forest reserves an area of more than 70,000 square miles. There is not a single Government forest reserve in the East.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

JAMES WILSON, *Secretary*.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the committee will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experimental gardens and grounds (salaries): One superintendent, \$2,500; 1 clerk, class 1, \$1,200; in all, \$3,700.

General expenses of experimental gardens and grounds, Department of Agriculture: Cultivation and care of experimental gardens and grounds, including the keep of lawns, trees, roadways, and walks; management and maintenance of the conservatories, greenhouses, and plant and fruit propagating houses; employment of foremen, gardeners, laborers, carpenters, painters, plumbers, and other mechanics; machinery, tools, wagons, carts, horses, harness, plows, lawn mowers, sprinklers, hose, watering cans, tubs, pots, and other implements required in cultivation; lumber, hardware, glass, paints, tin, stone, gravel, and other material required for repairs; fertilizers, insecticide apparatus, and chemicals; blacksmithing, horseshoeing, and repairs to implements and machinery; seeds, plants, and bulbs for propagating purposes; labels, potting and packing materials, feed for horses, freight and express charges, repairing roadways and walks, and for electric lighting, \$20,000; in all, for experimental gardens and grounds, \$23,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Entomology (salaries): One entomologist, who shall be chief of division, \$3,000; 1 assistant entomologist, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$2,000; 1 assistant entomologist or clerk, \$1,600; 1 assistant entomologist or clerk, \$1,400; 2 assistant entomologists or clerks, at \$1,200 each, \$2,400; 1 clerk, \$1,000; in all, \$11,400.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I will have to make a point of order on that paragraph.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the increase of salaries of all scientists was stricken out on a point of order. There were two scientific divisions not included in that; and I think it is only fair that those salaries should be also reduced so that all be on a par. I therefore move to amend in line 2, by striking out the words "three thousand" and inserting the words "twenty-five hundred dollars."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 2, page 28, strike out "three thousand" and insert "twenty-five hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Also, on line 4, strike out "two thousand" and insert "eighteen hundred."

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 4 strike out "two thousand" and insert "eighteen hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And in line 9 make an alteration in the total, from "eleven thousand four hundred" to "ten thousand seven hundred."

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9 strike out "eleven" and insert "ten," and same line strike out "four" and insert "seven."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask the adoption of the amendment which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "country," in line 11, page 29, the following: "And \$2,000 for a thorough investigation into the ravages of the gypsy moth in the State of Massachusetts, with a view to ascertaining the best remedial measures to be adopted for that section of the country."

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. A point of order against that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think it is subject to the point of order. I have no objection to that amendment, Mr. Chairman, but that subject-matter has been gone thoroughly over for three or four years by the State of Massachusetts trying to exterminate these moths; and the last information I had from the Department was that the scientists of Massachusetts were doing all they could to exterminate them, and that is all this Department knew about them.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has spent a great deal of money in endeavoring to destroy this moth. I believe that during the past five years that State has spent nearly a million dollars. Last year the stoppage of this appropriation by the State of Massachusetts arose from the fact that the State had spent so much without substantial results that a halt should be made for a while.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. The State of Massachusetts has abandoned the work.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Now, the gentleman from Connecticut, who has just made the statement that the State of Massachusetts abandoned it, knows, as a New England man, that this pest has committed great ravages in the State of Massachusetts, and there is great danger that this pest will get into the other States; and inasmuch as this present bill authorizes an appropriation of six or eight thousand dollars for investigations into the best method of eradicating in the Southern States the cotton-boll weevil, with a view to its extermination, and also an appropriation to investigate the ravages of the codling moth, in the Northwest, it seems to me that this appropriation to investigate into the best method of eradicating the gypsy moth ought to be inserted at this place in the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order is not being discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was not made.

Mr. HILL. The point of order was made by my colleague, Mr. HENRY.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I withhold the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut reserves the point of order.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. The State of Massachusetts, after expending for a long series of years a very large amount of money, aggregating more than a million dollars, has now abandoned this work, and is now asking the Government of the United States to take up the work with a pittance, an entering wedge—asking us to take up the burden that the State of Massachusetts has laid down.

Mr. KING. Is it confined to Massachusetts?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Yes; to the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the House that the State of Massachusetts has not entirely abandoned the work of driving out this pest. A large number of the people of that State feel that the United States Government should cooperate with the State in driving out this pest, and my colleague, Mr. THAYER, introduced a bill last year calling for an appropriation on the part of the National Government for this purpose. Now, this pest, as the gentleman from Connecticut indicated a moment ago, was very dangerous and destructive, and the State of Massachusetts has expended more than a million of dollars in five years in trying to eradicate it; and inasmuch as this bill provides legislation in this very section, appropriating money from the Treasury of the United States to investigate similar pests in different sections of the country, I can not see any injustice in asking Congress for an appropriation to investigate and find out just what is the best means of exterminating this pest.

Mr. GAINES. What is the name of the pest?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. The gypsy moth.

Mr. WHEELER. Why not extend it to bedbugs? [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES. Yes; and humbugs. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. If that were the case, I am afraid the Government would commence right in this Chamber. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Is it not true that the public sentiment of Massachusetts is in favor of abandoning this work—that they have accomplished no good? There has been an immense expenditure of money without attaining any result in their extermination. I think I must insist, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I wish to say that the gentleman from Connecticut is entirely mistaken if he thinks the sentiment in Massachusetts is against the effort to eradicate the pest. It was simply on account of the immense amount of money that has been expended. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has expended \$200,000 or more each year for five years or more to eradicate this pest. It certainly seems that when a paltry \$2,000 is asked for to investigate the subject it ought to be granted. Does the Chair decide in favor of the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut insist on his point of order?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Will not the Chair allow something to be said on the point of order? This amendment is along the same line as the appropriation in this same paragraph. As I understand this matter, the appropriation called for, beginning on line 2 and ending on line 11, is of the same nature, and therefore if this amendment is out of order the whole paragraph is out of order. I make the point of order, beginning on line 2 and ending on line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is too late. The paragraph has been discussed by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Then I respectfully submit to the Chair that the point of order made by the gentleman from Connecticut came too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut stated that he reserved the point of order on conclusion of the reading of the paragraph, which he had a right to do.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I think the RECORD will show, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman did not make his point of order until after debate had proceeded on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Total for Division of Entomology, \$36,900.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that by striking out, in line 13, the word "nine" and inserting "two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 13 strike out "nine" and insert "two."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Division of Biological Survey, salaries: One biologist, who shall be chief of division, \$3,000; 1 assistant biologist, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$2,000; 2 assistant biologists, at \$1,500 each, \$3,000; 1 assistant biologist, \$1,400; 1 clerk class 1, \$1,200; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each, \$2,000; 1 clerk, \$900; in all, \$13,500.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend in line 15 by striking out "\$3,000" and inserting "\$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 15 strike out "three thousand" and insert "two thousand five hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend in line 17, by striking out "two thousand" and inserting "one thousand eight hundred."

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 17 strike out "two thousand" and insert "one thousand eight hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In line 22, I move to strike out "thirteen" and insert "twelve."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, in line 33 I move to strike out "five" and insert "eight."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

General expenses of biological investigations: For biological investigations, including the geographic distribution and migrations of animals, birds, and plants; for the promotion of economic ornithology and mammalogy; for an investigation of the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collecting, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; for freight and express charges; for preparation and publication of reports, and for illustrations, field work, and traveling and other expenses in the practical work of the division, and to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act approved May 25, 1900, entitled "An act to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibiting the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes," \$20,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all points of order against this paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 30, in lines 17 and 18, strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Twenty-seven thousand five hundred dollars, of which \$1,000 shall be immediately available."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of Agriculture has requested that \$20,000 be stricken out and \$27,500 be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York state his point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is new legislation; it increases expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. It simply increases the appropriation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, the reason for this amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that the point of order will lie.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then I will withdraw it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Secretary of Agriculture, I am informed, asked for this amendment for the purpose of investigating and ascertaining the best means of destroying prairie dogs, pocket gophers, ground squirrels, and other mammals, enemies

to plant life in the United States. I will further state that although these investigations and experiments are being carried on, the committee has refused the appropriation asked for by the Department, as I am informed, to carry on the investigations already begun.

The reason of the request that part of this appropriation be made immediately available is that early in the spring, when the animals are young, these investigations can be made better than they can after July 1, when this appropriation would be available.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In other words, they can be killed more easily in the spring.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Investigation can be made much better in the spring, when vegetation is just springing up, than in winter or in the summer.

My direct interest in this question is in connection with the extermination of the prairie dog. Early in the spring these dogs destroy more grass by destroying the roots than in any other part of the year. Hence that is the best time for destroying these animals by poison, when other food is scarce.

The Secretary, I am informed, is very much in earnest in asking that this appropriation be made for the purpose of exterminating these various pests. In our Western country prairie dogs are a very great injury to the stock-raising industry because they destroy the grass.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Agricultural Department investigated those animals a few years ago, and the investigation now proposed would be a repetition of work already done. The Department has not yet been able to discover any means of exterminating the animals.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. My State has passed laws providing for the extermination of prairie dogs, and its citizens are still carrying on investigations along that line. If a man having a farm undertakes to destroy these animals on his farm, they frequently leave it and spread themselves on the neighboring farms.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Suppose the United States should go down there and destroy these dogs—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The United States Government owns millions of acres of land in New Mexico, Oklahoma, and the West, where these pests exist, and it would add immensely to the value of that land and to the value of the stock raised there if some definite means were discovered for eradicating prairie dogs.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Department two or three years ago went fully into this question, and it has not succeeded in finding any remedy.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The Department is now making this investigation. I have conferred with employees of the Department within the last three days in regard to the investigation, and they were anxious to have this appropriation raised to the amount mentioned in my amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The committee has had no application of that kind. I had an interview with the Secretary a few days ago, and this matter was not suggested.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. A gentleman from the Department called on me and gave me the data I hold in my hand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can say almost positively that the Secretary has always ridiculed this idea of trying to exterminate the prairie dogs. I think there must be some mistake about this matter.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Did not the Secretary ask an appropriation of \$27,500?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have increased the appropriation \$2,500. Last year it was only \$17,500.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. But I understand that the amount asked for this year was \$27,500.

Mr. GAINES. How is it proposed to exterminate these animals?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. WADSWORTH] whether he will assent to this amendment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the amendment ought not to go on the bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman insist on a point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the appropriation in the bill is sufficient to answer all the practical purposes of that division.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understood that the gentleman from New York raised a point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I did not raise a point of order. The question must be submitted to the judgment of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KING. If the Government should go upon the public lands and exterminate the prairie dogs, ought it not to go upon the public domain and exterminate the wolves and bears that are so destructive to the sheep herds grazing upon the domain of the Government?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If you want anything of that kind, why do you not make an effort to get it into this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. I do not want it. That is just what I was complaining about.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is a matter of great importance to the stockraisers and farmers of the Western section of the country. We only ask an appropriation necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department.

Mr. KING. I only wanted to get the views of the gentleman as to whether he thought this was a proper proceeding on the part of the Federal Government to go out on the public lands and endeavor to exterminate these animals.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If they can be exterminated, they should be.

Mr. GAINES. How do you propose to exterminate them?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They are investigating that question now, and the appropriation which is suggested here is for the purpose of enabling them to carry on the work.

Mr. GAINES. Can not the people there kill them?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Not always.

Mr. GAINES. Why, Mr. Chairman, last November a year ago, when I went to San Francisco to bring home the First Tennessee Regiment, which I did, for thousands of miles close to the towns and villages, all along about the houses, and invariably along the line of the railway, there were hundreds upon hundreds of these little dogs hopping in and hopping out of holes in the ground. It was noted as a matter of entertainment to travelers over the line. The railroads themselves seemed to protect them in the interest of their lines.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If you owned lands out there you would not want them protected.

Mr. GAINES (continuing). They are looked upon as one of the natural and interesting curiosities of the country; and to destroy this happy "land of canine" would be in derogation of the rights and privileges of people of that part of the country [laughter], and especially on private lands.

Mr. KING. Especially the rights of the "canines."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CORLISS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the portions of the paragraph between lines 12 and 18 are not new legislation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will state to the gentleman that that is authorized by law, to carry into effect the provisions of an act enlarging the powers of the Department in that regard. That empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to use some money in pursuance of that law. That is to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the act approved May 25, 1900, entitled "An act to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibiting the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of the local laws."

Mr. CORLISS. I understand that; but I think it a useless expenditure of the public money, and I would like to raise the point of order against it. It seems to me that it is not proper to be placed in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is simply an appropriation of money to carry out the purposes of what is known as the Lacey Act, passed by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GROSVENOR in the chair). The Chair is not informed as to what the point of order is or to what section of the bill it applies.

Mr. CORLISS. I refer to page 20 of the bill, commencing in line 12, down to and including line 18. An appropriation is made here for an investigation with reference to another law, the law that was passed last year, which prohibited the transportation, by interstate commerce, of certain birds or other game killed out of season from one State to another. This is an attempt, I presume, to carry out the provisions of that act.

It seems to me that it is not a proper thing to place such an appropriation upon this bill. And while I am in doubt about the matter, I raise the point of order upon it, and will leave the question to the determination of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair had the act before him and there was no appropriation in that act for carrying into effect its purposes, the Chair could rule more intelligently; but the Chair will assume that there was a provision for carrying it into effect and that this continues that provision. And so the Chair will overrule the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Division of Biological Survey, \$33,500.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In line 19, I move to strike out "three" and insert "two." That difference in the total is made necessary by the difference in salary.

The Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

In line 19 strike out "three" and insert "two."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In line 20 I move to strike out "five" and insert "eight."

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 20 strike out "five" and insert "eight."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Division of Publications: For the preparation, printing, illustration, publication, indexing, and distribution of documents, bulletins, and reports, \$105,000; of which sum \$57,500 shall be available for the preparation and printing of farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interest of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as each Senator, Representative, or Delegate shall direct: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify Senators and Representatives of the title and character of each such bulletin, and also of any other publication of the Department of Agriculture not sent to the folding rooms of the Senate and House, with the total number to which each Senator, Representative, and Delegate may be entitled for distribution; and on the face of the envelope inclosing said bulletins shall be printed the title of each bulletin contained therein: *Provided further*, That all such bulletins included in the quotas of Senators, Representatives, or Delegates not called for on or before the 30th day of June in each fiscal year shall revert to the Secretary of Agriculture, and be available to him, either for miscellaneous distribution or in making up Congressional quotas for the next fiscal year; for the pay of artists, draftsmen, and engravers, and of proofreaders and indexers when necessary; for the purchase of manuscript for publication, and of tools, instruments, and artists' materials; for printing proofs, charts, and maps; for drawings, engravings, photographs, paintings, lithographs, other illustrations, and electrotypes, and for traveling expenses when necessary; for paper, envelopes, gum, twine, and other necessary material; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$47,500; for the rent of a building not to exceed \$2,500 per annum, for the storage of publications; in all, \$107,500.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer some amendments to this section. On page 32, line 1, after the word "and" insert "fifty," and after the word "sum" strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred and."

The Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

Page 32, line 1, after the word "and," insert "fifty," so that it will read "\$155,000;" and after "sum" strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred and," so that it will read "of which sum \$107,500."

Mr. LATIMER. And on page 32, in line 19, I move to strike out the words "30th day of June" and insert "1st day of March."

The Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

Page 32, line 19, strike out "30th day of June" and insert "1st day of March."

Mr. LATIMER. On the same page in line 22, I move to strike out "for the next fiscal year."

The Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

Line 22, strike out "for the next fiscal year."

Mr. LATIMER. On page 33, line 7, I move to strike out "forty" and insert "fifty;" so that it will read "\$57,000."

The Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

Page 33, line 7, strike out "forty" and insert "fifty."

Mr. LATIMER. And in line 10 insert the word "sixty" after the word "and;" so that it will read "\$167,500."

The Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after the word "and," insert "sixty."

Mr. LATIMER. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the committee for a moment, I want to state that this bill carries an appropriation of \$780,000 to carry on experiments at the different stations, one in each State, in order to get the information which the farmers all over this country are interested in and that is contained in these bulletins. But for the publication of this information after we have obtained it we spend only \$57,000 dollars. Think of it, 50,000,000 people, at least, interested and needing the information, for which we pay dearly in providing for the station. There are over 200 different subjects treated in these bulletins in which every farmer in this country is interested, and for these 200 bulletins only \$57,000 is spent in publication.

The allotment given to each member of Congress is about 7,000 bulletins. Now, the object of this increase is to add \$50,000 for the publication of bulletins, so as to make the total \$107,000 and to give to each member of Congress 14,000 bulletins instead of 7,000. I hold, gentlemen of this House, that there is no information, no matter printed by this Government and sent to the country in which the people are more interested and from which they get more valuable information than in these agricultural bulletins containing the reports on agricultural experiments made at these different stations each year. It has been claimed that there has been a waste of money in publishing these bulletins. I deny it.

The object of my amendment striking out the "thirtieth of June" and inserting the "first of March," is to cause the bulletins not taken by members to lapse to the Secretary earlier, so they can be allotted to members who want them by giving the Secretary of Agriculture the power to reapportion these bulletins to members of Congress so they can be sent to the country. There are a great many city representatives here whose constituents are not interested in these bulletins.

If you do not allow these bulletins to lapse to the Secretary of

Agriculture until the 30th of June or about the 1st of July, the members of Congress have gone to their homes, their minds have been diverted on other lines, and these bulletins are allowed to lie there in the hands of the Secretary and cumber his shelves, occupying valuable storage room. If you allow them to lapse to the Secretary on the 1st of March he can reapportion them to members who send them to their constituents, and the people of the country will get the advantage of this important information.

Now, I want to say to the members of this House, if you desire to reserve your bulletins all you have to do is to notify the Secretary of Agriculture that you desire to reserve our quota, and they will be kept there at your command.

But if you fail to serve this notice, why should the bulletins be allowed to lie there in the hands of the Secretary and go over another year, as was done formerly? It is stated here on the floor of the House that there were 1,500,000 left over the year before last.

Mr. GRIGGS. If the gentleman will permit me, how long will these bulletins remain there subject to the requisition of members, under your amendment?

Mr. LATIMER. When the member indicates that he wants them they are kept until he calls for them. If not reserved they lapse March 1 each year.

Mr. GRIGGS. How long will they have been there?

Mr. LATIMER. From the time they are printed.

Mr. GRIGGS. What time are they accredited to members?

Mr. LATIMER. Sometime in the fall. For instance, last year the bulletins printed during the summer and fall were put to the credit of members. About the time Congress met, I think.

Mr. GRIGGS. When is the member notified that they are put to his credit?

Mr. LATIMER. I do not know the exact time.

Mr. GRIGGS. What I insist on is that they shall be there long enough for members to be able to get them.

Mr. LATIMER. I will say in answer to that that my recollection is we were notified last year before we came to Congress—in the interim before Congress met—that we had so many bulletins allotted to our credit. We came in December, and until the 1st of March these bulletins were lying to our credit, and if we notify the Secretary they will be kept to our credit; but if we fail up to the 1st of March they are not kept any longer. The law now prevents them reverting to the Secretary until June 30, and therefore, without the law is changed as I propose, many of these bulletins are not sent out, but are allotted the following year and have to be given storage room.

Mr. McCULLOCH. As I understand, they are to be kept at the Secretary's office?

Mr. LATIMER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I represent a large agricultural district, probably one of the richest in Pennsylvania. I want to say to the House that of the farmers' bulletins given to me I select from them—I do not select any with reference to raising cotton and other Southern products—but I have my room full of them, and have plenty of them at home. Every farmer in my district, Mr. Chairman, who wants a bulletin on peach culture—and I represent one of the largest peach-culture districts in the State—or how to make and preserve manure, and how to raise his chickens, or how to water his ducks, I send these bulletins to them. I have plenty of them, and I will turn over to the gentleman from South Carolina several thousand of them that my people do not need. I represent, I suppose, five times as much farming as he does in his district. Now, a word in regard to this matter—

Mr. TALBERT. I would be willing to take all the bulletins that the gentleman does not need.

Mr. MAHON. I am willing to give to the farmers of this country who are willing to read and investigate and make proper use of these bulletins all they require, but the past appropriations and this appropriation not only give them enough but more than enough. The trouble, Mr. Chairman, as to these public documents is, I am afraid, they are distributed by many members not to educate and enlighten the farmer, but to get his good will and probably secure his vote at the election. I tried that in my past experience. I put it to a fair test. I took three districts in my home country and sent a public document to every voter on the register list. At the ensuing election in every one of those districts I ran behind the ticket [laughter], and in all the rest, where I had not sent them, I ran ahead. [Renewed laughter.] In all these districts where I tried to put a public document when I was making this test there were ten to fifteen men who were not on the register list, and as they did not get a document they took it as a slight.

Mr. LACEY. If the gentleman will permit me, is it not possible that where the most information was disseminated is where you ran worst?

Mr. MAHON. That might be. But this indiscriminate sending of public documents to constituents amounts to nothing so far as your political futures are concerned. Many of them are used in the barber shops for making waste paper to use in shaving.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to give every farmer in this country, and every scientific man, and every other person all needed information, but we have reached that point in this country where we should have a building where we can store these publications. It is entirely right to print them; and when any constituent writes for one you can send an order down and immediately have it mailed to him. If this Congress would do that—furnish documents to men who want them and will use them properly—this Government can save millions of dollars annually by stopping the indiscriminate circulation of documents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you talk about not having enough of these farmers' bulletins. I assert again, without fear of successful contradiction by the gentleman from South Carolina, that this appropriation will give all the bulletins he wants for the farmers of his district who will read them; and if you want to send them to every man—and I suppose you have got some of them, as I have—to read some of them, you might as well put them to translate the Greek grammar, as many of these documents are hard to digest intelligently.

Now, why increase it? You can get four or five thousand of them on different subjects, on every agricultural industry in your district, and certainly there is no man in this House who has more men who want these publications than he gets bulletins for.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to express my disagreement with the utterances of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] in what he says about the distribution of farmers' bulletins. In the first place, he is in error when he says that we can get 5,000 bulletins on any subject. The truth is that we can only get 500 on any subject. There are at least 50 of these bulletins published by the Government which ought to be circulated to every intelligent farmer in my district; and, sir, there are 30,000 such farmers there.

The gentleman says that members circulate these things in order to get votes. In a measure that is true. We endeavor to secure the votes of our constituents by proving ourselves worthy of them, and how better can we show our worthiness than by being awake to the interests of the people whom we represent. How could we get votes by sending to a farmer that which he does not want, does not appreciate, does not read, does not understand. The fact that we send these bulletins to the farmers in our districts is evidence in itself that our farmers do read them and appreciate them. I sent them out promiscuously through my district last session, as far as my quota would reach, and when I went out there the farmers came to me and thanked me for what I had done and expressed their keenest appreciation, not only of the interest that I had taken in them, but also of the worth of the literature that I had placed in their hands.

The gentleman says that the bulletins sent to his district are used mostly for paper upon which to wipe razors, and that the farmers there do not read them. In my opinion, he does injustice to the farmers whom he represents on this floor. At least, I know that the farmers are the most persistent and studious readers and thinkers of all the various vocations who inhabit my district, and I think this is true of every other district in our Western States. Sir, the farmers constitute the great reading and thinking class, whose intelligence, conservatism, patriotism, and individual independence must at last stay the wayward course of this Government, if indeed it shall be stayed from its subversion.

The gentleman says that if any farmer wants one of these bulletins he can write to the Department and get it. Yes, sir; but how is he to know what bulletins the Government has for distribution? There is many a bulletin published by the Government which the farmer would read with the greatest relish if he had it, but how is he to know that it is to be had?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I interrupt the gentleman? I desire to call his attention to the fact that there is in about every other one of the bulletins a list of the number and subjects of the publications they can have by writing for them. I do not interject this in opposition to the gentleman's position.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I am glad that the gentleman has called attention to that fact. It is necessary to call the attention of the members of this House to the fact in order that they may know it. And if the members of Congress who direct this work do not know of its existence, how shall we expect the people to know? Members should be familiar with the needs of their districts, and should go to the trouble to look over these publications and select such as can be circulated to advantage among their respective constituencies. Having made the selection, they should send them out without waiting for the farmer to make a special request for each little document that might be useful. Let there be placed at my disposal enough of this literature to go around with my constituency, and I shall find pleasure in placing it in the hands of those people whose generous confidence has made me their Representative.

Any member who is unwilling to do this is unwilling to perform his duty to his people. The gentleman tells us there is little value in this literature. Sir, this bill appropriates nearly a

million of dollars for experimental work by the Department of Agriculture. What is the use of all this experimentation if the people to be benefited by it are not to be made acquainted with the results? I want this experimental work done by the Department, and I am willing to vote the funds requisite for that purpose; but, sir, when an experiment has been made, I want the results of it published in a bulletin and I want enough copies of it to spread the information among the farmers of my district.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. Can not the gentleman state to the House that the Government spends thousands of dollars every year collecting commercial information, publishing it in consular reports for the benefit of the commercial classes of the country; and, following the same line, why ought not the same thing be done for the agricultural classes?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for the suggestion. We spend multiplied thousands of dollars collecting data and statistics on foreign trade and publishing it for the information of commercial and manufacturing classes, and place it at the disposal of gentlemen here who represent commercial and manufacturing districts to be distributed. No matter how great the expenditures for these purposes are the gentleman from Pennsylvania never raises his voice to complain. "It is only when something is to be done for the farmers—that great army of industrial people who create no trusts, form no associations to control Congressional action, maintain no lobbies to promote their interests, that independent self-reliant class, which, standing upon its own merits, has no agents to represent them at this Capitol except their own chosen representatives upon this floor—that the gentleman's agonizing soul constrains him to cry out for a reduction of an appropriation."

Mr. Chairman, at the last session of Congress I made my first speech on this floor. Then, as now, I spoke for the farmer. While I stood here making that plea I noticed a derisive smile pass through this Chamber, which discovered to me that I had done an unfashionable thing to champion the cause of the agriculturalist. To-day, standing here advocating that same cause, I observe the same derision and contempt. Nevertheless, sir, I know that I am doing my country the great service of which I am capable in this House when I raise my voice or cast my vote in behalf of the farmer. Upon his success and prosperity depends the success and prosperity of the whole people.

Sir, I shall cast my vote for increasing the number of bulletins. I believe that no gentleman on this floor, coming from a farming district, will say that he could not circulate 100,000 of these bulletins among his people to advantage. Give the farmer a chance. Let him understand that he, too, is an object of the fostering care of this Government, and his industry, intelligence, and patriotism will yield back a thousandfold that which is given to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat has undertaken to intimate that I do not properly represent the interests of my constituents. I want to say to that gentleman that if he will come to Pennsylvania as a Democrat and preach his Populist doctrine in relation to the farmers—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. MAHON. Wait till I am done. If the gentleman will go upon the stump and talk about the great manufacturing establishments of that State—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MAHON. I will yield in a moment. I say, if the gentleman will talk about the great manufacturing interests of that State on a rostrum at a Democratic meeting—if he undertakes to howl against the railroads and against capital that has blessed our Commonwealth and made it one of the greatest of the Union—before he is through he would not have a corporal's guard to hear the peroration of that political speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are the kings of that Commonwealth. What has made them such? Gentlemen talk here about the bulletins of the Agricultural Department. I am not opposed to these bulletins; but the men in my Commonwealth who manage those magnificent farms can come down here to Washington and give these people over in the Agricultural Department lessons in agriculture. Men who have peach orchards there with twenty or thirty thousand trees know more about peach culture in a day than these departmental officers do in a month.

I will tell you what has made the farmers of Pennsylvania the independent and powerful people that they are. It is because within sight of almost every farm you will see a little manufacturing town that has built up for them and their products the best market that the country affords.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, at the last election not a solitary Populist vote was cast; and why? Because in that rich and magnificent State, with her great farms, whose owners do not come here to beg appropriations as a matter of charity—on that soil a Populist can not be born or can not grow. If born in the morning at 6 o'clock, he would expire before 6 o'clock in the evening.

[Laughter.] And the chances are that Providence, favoring that magnificent Commonwealth, would in some way interfere so that the Populist who might be born there would come into the world stillborn. [Laughter.]

The gentleman says I do not represent the farmers of Pennsylvania and of my district. I do represent them; and I say now that this extravagant expenditure of money, this indiscriminate circulation of bulletins and all this stuff that is printed about farming, is not asked for by my constituents. I have my office filled with these documents, and my farmer constituents absolutely refuse to take many of them.

Mr. LATIMER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. LATIMER. Are you in favor of the expenditure of \$780,000 to continue experiments at these experiment stations?

Mr. MAHON. Why did you not fight it if you opposed it?

Mr. LATIMER. I had not heard of the gentleman opposing it.

Mr. MAHON. That is just the reason I made a point of order against creating these different bureaus. What is going to be the result of it? If you let it go on, it is going to be a constantly growing thing. The next thing we will be asked to appropriate a million of dollars for some new investigations and some new bureaus; the next will be the establishment of new scientific operations to be appropriated for, and new bureaus, with all of the force necessary to carry them on. I am opposed to that whole system.

Mr. RUCKER. Are you in favor of an appropriation of \$10,000 for furnishing a free library to the people of Washington?

Mr. MAHON. If they pay for it, I am. If they read, they will not be Populists.

Mr. RUCKER. Did not you vote \$10,000 for this purpose? Did not you vote for a bill that passed the House appropriating \$10,000 from the public funds to maintain a free library for the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, I did; and I will again if the opportunity offers.

Mr. RUCKER. But now you are opposed to a small appropriation by which some 60,000,000 of people may be enabled to get information of value to the farmers to get reading matter throughout the country.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; I am opposed to that. Sixty millions of people do not want the kind of information you are going to send out to them. They do not want to read about the feathers on ducks, and whether they should drink filtered water or unfiltered water. [Laughter.] Why, farmers in Pennsylvania can tell you more about the value of manure and how to apply it than all the information you can get from the Agricultural Department in a year. That is the reason that I am opposed to the whole thing. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. When I spoke a few moments ago I addressed myself exclusively to the Agricultural Department and the interests of the agricultural classes. I made no reference to the great manufacturing interests of which the gentleman speaks. I said not a word about Democracy, Republicanism, or Populism. I confined myself exclusively to the question before this committee.

Mr. MAHON. Did not you say—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I decline to be interrupted. The gentleman would not allow me to interrupt him, and I shall not yield to him now.

Mr. Chairman, what was there in my remarks to call forth the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? I said that the farming interest was the greatest interest in the United States. Is that Populism? If so, then I am a Populist. The gentleman says that I could not come into Pennsylvania and make such a speech as I have made here. Possibly not. It may be that if I were to go there and make a speech in the interest of the agriculturists some tool of the trusts might hit me with a chunk of coal. [Laughter.]

Sir, I come from a part of the country where the people are as free to voice their sentiments as are the waters of their brooks and rivers to run down to the sea. [Applause.] No minion of the monopolies goes there to post notices on our doors that if the candidate of plutocracy shall not be elected the employment of our people shall cease. There every man is his own man, be he Democrat, Republican, or Populist.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania talks of farming in his district. He has a great team with which he does his plowing—Quay and anti-Quay. I do not know to which of these fat horses he gives the most feed. [Laughter and applause.]

The gentleman is able, ardent, and eloquent when he speaks for his constituents, and there can be heard in his words of burning oratory that we should do something for the downtrodden shipyards in the hands of the Cramps. The gentleman will always be found able, ardent, and eloquent in favor of his great constituency, the trusts; but when, forsooth, a member coming from the

wide West, where farming is the chief industry, gets up on this floor and says that the farmers have a right to be considered by the Government as well as the trusts and the favored classes, the gentleman thrusts his tongue into his cheek and cries, "Populism!" [Applause.]

Now, if demanding fair treatment for the greatest industry in this land, the industry upon which all others are based and which receives less from the Government than any other, is "Populism," then I desire to be classed as a Populist. I made no attack upon any class of people, nor do I intend to do so. It is my desire to see every industry in this great country of ours flourish. To-day I spoke only for the farmers, and I have learned here upon the banks of the Potomac what I never knew in the West, that every man who stands for the interests of the people against the favored classes that dominate this country is a "Populist." Whoever stands for the agricultural classes stands for all the people. The manufacturer, the railroads, the commercial and financial interests are all dependent upon the welfare and prosperity of the farming classes of this country, and it is to the interest of all that these great classes should be built up and cared for. [Applause.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I represent a farming community, and I say they are the most independent men in the State of Pennsylvania. I do not need to come here and make these beggarly pleas in behalf of the farmers. The farmer of Pennsylvania wants a fair market for his products, but at the same time I stand for the laboring man and the professional man, and the farmer does not want to raise the price of everything that the laboring man must use so it will be beyond his reach. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that some men upon the floor of this House do not appear to have any interest in any person except the farmer. Why, does not the gentleman who has just addressed the House know that the great working population of Pennsylvania must be fed? Our farmers do not want to put the price of their products beyond the reach of those laboring men.

The gentleman talks about suppressing votes in my Commonwealth. I deny that. I tell him that the manufacturers of the State of Pennsylvania—and I know it from experience—are the last class of men to go down into the shops and tell their men how to vote. Why is that? No manufacturer in that State is going to put himself under obligations of that kind. He will neither humiliate himself nor humiliate the men who are working for him by asking such a thing or dictating to them how they shall vote. You talk about your State of Missouri. I will tell you what we do in Pennsylvania. Every man in that Commonwealth who is 21 years of age, whether he is a Democrat, a black Republican, or a white Republican, is allowed to put his vote into the ballot box. There is no suppression of votes in Pennsylvania.

Mr. TALBERT. How about Philadelphia?

Mr. MAHON. Philadelphia is the same. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] Why, my friend from South Carolina, you know as little about the vote in Pennsylvania and the politics of that State as the man in the moon. You may think you do; but I want you gentlemen from the Southland to understand that we simply regulate the votes in the great State of Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. May I ask the gentleman a question? I want to ask him what he is mad about.

Mr. MAHON. We say to every man who is 21 years old and upward, who has lived in the State one year and who has paid a tax sixty days before the election, whether he is rich or poor, black or white, Democrat or Republican, "You can vote on the day of election."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. He votes twice in Philadelphia.

Mr. MAHON. No; he does not do anything of the kind. And while I am willing to admit that irregularities may creep into all elections in all States, the people of Pennsylvania are not ballot robbers, and they do not deprive one-half of their people of the right to vote.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. How about the last election in Philadelphia?

Mr. MAHON. You do not know anything about Philadelphia.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the question for this committee to decide is whether the appropriation made by the Committee on Agriculture, according to the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture, and with his approval, is sufficient to disseminate broadcast over this land this valuable agricultural information. Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to the number of bulletins that we have already distributed over this country, according to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture. The total number of bulletins issued during the year, including reprints, amounts to 2,360,000 copies. The total number of copies of these bulletins issued from the beginning aggregates 13,630,500. Of this enormous number over 7,000,000 copies have been issued during the present Administration, and the total number of copies distributed since the beginning, through the Senators,

Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, exceeds eight and a half million copies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, looking at it from another point of view, the average population of a Congressional district is about 200,000. One-fifth of that represents heads of families, or about 40,000, and on the basis of between 7,000 and 8,000 copies for each member, we are distributing now, under the appropriation as put in this bill, about one copy to every five of the heads of families in the United States. That includes all the cities and villages, and includes mechanics and merchants who do not want them at all; so that in fact, I dare say, if you could get at the truth accurately, we are distributing bulletins now to one in every three of the heads of families in the farming districts of the United States.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, it does seem to me, in all justice and in all fairness—and I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina; I am in favor of a very free distribution of this important knowledge—the number we print is all sufficient. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask the chairman of the committee this question: If in his opinion he knows or does not know that these bulletins are appreciated by the farmers, and that they are constantly asking and seeking for more of them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly; I know they are very excellent literature. But the only point for this committee to decide is this—are we distributing enough of them or not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is the other fact that I want to bring out—that the farmers appreciate these bulletins, and are constantly wanting them. I will say to the gentleman that the farmers appreciate everything that we send to them, even the seeds that do not come up.

Mr. GRIGGS. Will the gentleman state how much money we spend in getting that information? Is it not \$780,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I so stated to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GRIGGS. Does not the gentleman think, if we pay \$780,000 to get up the information, that \$107,000 is a very small amount for the printing?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it is not. For a hundred thousand dollars you can get a great deal of printing done.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. And there is the Yearbook.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And, as the gentleman from Connecticut reminds me, there is the Yearbook, which contains practically all these bulletins, or a portion of them. It is composed principally of bulletins.

Mr. GRIGGS. And we get between nine hundred and a thousand of those.

Mr. OTEY. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATIMER. I want the floor in my own right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is going on, year by year. Rome was not built in a day. We are doing it every year, and doing it just about as fast as the Agricultural Department can collect the information.

Mr. OTEY. Just let me ask you about this one in every three.

Mr. WADSWORTH. One head of family in every three.

Mr. OTEY. But wait. There are some sixty-odd bulletins.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I make the point of order that debate is exhausted on this paragraph.

Mr. OTEY. The gentleman has yielded to me for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. But his time had expired. Debate upon this amendment is exhausted, and the point of order is made by the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LATIMER. I claim the right to close debate, as I offered the amendment. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I want just one moment to try to answer the arguments made by the chairman of this committee, who states that the Secretary of Agriculture has not recommended this increased appropriation. I admit that. The Secretary of Agriculture says that this is a question for the members of the House to decide. He has no desire to dictate how many bulletins nor the kind we shall send to the country.

He is there as the servant of Congress to do the will of Congress, and he does it nobly. When we have passed a law authorizing him to have so many bulletins printed and we appropriate the money for it, he is willing and ready to carry out the law as passed by Congress. It is a question, gentlemen of this House, for every member of this House to pass upon, whether he has enough bulletins to supply his constituents under the present quota allotted or whether he wants an increased allotment.

I appeal to members on this floor to vote upon this question with regard to the wants of their constituents. There will be no opposition from the Secretary of Agriculture, but, on the other hand, we will find him ready always to respond to the will of Congress.

Mr. GRIGGS. He has expressed no opinion to the contrary, has he?

Mr. LATIMER. Not at all. It is a question, he says, entirely left to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York, the chairman of this committee, states that one out of three can get a bulletin under the present allotment. What right have we to discriminate against the other two-thirds of the heads of families of this country? If this is valuable information, if it is information under which the farmers of this country can develop and improve their farms, and if it is right to spend \$780,000 in getting these experiments, in employing the best talent in this country to experiment on different lines in the interest of agriculture, why should we not print enough of the bulletins that the head of every family should have the information that he desires bearing upon these important experiments?

I hold that with these bulletins printed by the Department on different subjects we should not only print enough of them to give the heads of families who farm one bulletin, but enough should be printed to furnish one on any subject he may desire to have information upon. If these bulletins can not be furnished and sent to the people in order to educate them, then we ought to blot out the appropriation of \$780,000.

There is a tendency, Mr. Chairman, on the part of Congress to provide liberally for certain Departments, and extravagantly on certain lines; but when you undertake to distribute information and accomplish results in the interest of the people, then there is a great cry against the appropriation.

Let us legislate in the interests of the people; and if these appropriations are to be kept on the statute book to keep up the experiments, let us print the information and send it to the people. Give the members of Congress an opportunity to send out bulletins on all these subjects treated on by these experimental stations. I hope the amendment which I have offered will be voted into the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Assuming that the gentleman is correct, that every head of a family should be supplied with bulletins, I suppose he would advocate having 15,000,000 copies of those bulletins.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, to call attention to one of the amendments offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, which I think ought not to prevail. That is the amendment shortening the time in which members of Congress may send out the bulletins before the Secretary of Agriculture takes them into possession. We all know that during the winter we in Washington not only have our own hands full, but our clerks have their hands full with correspondence and with addressing the seed slips, which this year amount to 9,000, and it would put the clerks to this additional work of addressing the bulletins at a time when they have not the opportunity. It would cause a great deal of inconvenience.

Now, when we adjourn in March we have until the following December, and it is a period of rest for both the member of Congress and the clerks. It would be a great deal better that we should have up to June, if we are going to have these bulletins at our disposal, so the clerks can work upon the addresses and send them out at periods during the vacation time. Personally I am opposed to increasing the number, because, although I represent a farming as well as a city district, I often find that I have duplicated bulletins time and time again in the quota I have sent out to the farmers. They have written me telling me they have had copies of the bulletin which I sent out before. My quota of 4,000 last fall is still uncalled for.

Mr. LATIMER. If the gentleman will allow an interruption, I want to state that the object of the amendment is not to take the bulletins away from the member of Congress on the 1st of March, but it is to allow all members who do not intend to take them to say so and let them go to other members. If he wants his quota, all he has got to do is to notify the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BROMWELL. That is what I object to. If the law stands as it is now, I do not have to send notice to the Secretary.

Mr. LATIMER. If you go till July, that is too late to send them out.

Mr. BROMWELL. But I am opposed to the Secretary taking possession of them on the 1st of March.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have heard it stated on the floor of this House that the amount of money appropriated for gathering information to be published in these bulletins represents \$780,000. If that is true, is it not absurd to lock that information, for which we have paid so dear, in the minds of the people who wrote those bulletins? Is it not wise to spend a few thousand dollars in sending out these bulletins containing that information, so that it can reach the people for whom it is intended? It seems to me that the appropriation for the publication of this information ought to be a great deal more than the appropriation to get the information itself. There-

fore it seems to me to be a modest request to increase this appropriation for publication only \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the amendment increasing the amount \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands there are several amendments offered, and the gentleman can call for a separate vote on each amendment if he wishes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask for a separate vote on each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 32, line 1, after the word "and," insert "fifty," so as to read "\$155,000." And in the same line strike out the word "fifty" and insert "one hundred," so as to read "\$167,500."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask for a vote on the first amendment, which is to increase the appropriation \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will be taken on the first amendment read by the Clerk.

The question was taken; and on a division (called for by Mr. LATIMER) there were 74 ayes and 64 noes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. LATIMER.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 92 and noes 86.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. By an error of the Clerk, two divisions of the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina were read as one. That error was corrected, and only one has been voted upon. The next question is upon the amendment which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "sum," in line 1, page 32, strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred and," so as to read; "of which sum \$107,500 shall be immediately available."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope that amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. LATIMER. We have just adopted that amendment, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk read two amendments together. Then the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture asked a separate vote on each proposition; and the vote was taken on the first proposition. The Chair understands that this is the second.

Mr. LATIMER. This is simply to make the language conform—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already decided that these amendments are divisible; and the vote was taken on the first of them. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just read. The question being taken, there were—ayes 67, noes 67.

Mr. LATIMER. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. LATIMER were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 93, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The next division of Mr. LATIMER's amendment was read, as follows:

On page 32, in line 19, strike out "30th day of June" and insert "1st day of March."

Mr. LATIMER. I withdraw that amendment, with the consent of the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

The next division of Mr. LATIMER's amendment was read, as follows:

On page 32, after the word "quota," in line 22, strike out the words "for the next fiscal year."

Mr. LATIMER. I withdraw that amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment was withdrawn.

The next division of Mr. LATIMER's amendment was read, as follows:

On page 33, after the word "elsewhere" in line 7, strike out "forty" and insert "fifty," so as to read "\$57,500."

Mr. LATIMER. That only makes the language conform to the action already taken.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is all right, inasmuch as the other branches of the amendment have been adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next division of Mr. LATIMER's amendment was read, as follows:

After the word "and" in line 10, and before the word "seven," insert "sixty," so as to read "\$167,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Division of Publications, \$132,520.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Inasmuch as the amendments already adopted have altered the figures, this should read "\$192,520." I move an amendment.

Mr. LATIMER. That is all right.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS.

Agricultural experiment stations: To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto," and to enforce the execution thereof, \$789,000, \$33,000 of which sum shall be payable upon the order of the Secretary of Agriculture, to enable him to carry out the provisions of section 3 of said act of March 2, 1887, and \$12,000 of which sum may be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report to Congress upon the agricultural resources and capabilities of Alaska; and to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in said Territory, including the erection of buildings and all other expenses essential to the maintenance of such stations, of which sum \$3,000 shall be immediately available; and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required by section 3 of said act of March 2, 1887; shall ascertain whether the expenditures under the appropriation hereby made are in accordance with the provisions of said act, and shall make report thereon to Congress; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons as he may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and to incur such other expenses for office fixtures and supplies, stationery, traveling, freight, and express charges, illustration of the Experiment Station Record, bulletins and reports, as he may find essential in carrying out the objects of the above acts, and the sums apportioned to the several States shall be paid quarterly in advance. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to furnish to such institutions or individuals as may care to buy them copies of the card index of agricultural literature prepared by the Office of Experiment Stations, and charge for the same a price covering the additional expense involved in the preparation of these copies, and he is hereby authorized to apply the moneys received toward the expense of the preparation of the index. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to expend \$12,000 of which sum to establish and maintain an agricultural station in the Hawaiian Islands, including the erection of buildings, the printing (in the Hawaiian Islands), illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other expenses essential to the maintenance of said station. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to expend \$12,000 of which sum to establish and maintain an agricultural experiment station in Porto Rico, including the erection of buildings, the printing (in Porto Rico), illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other expenses essential to the maintenance of said station; in all, \$789,000.

Mr. LANDIS. I move to amend by adding, after line 2, page 39, the clause which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no part of the appropriation shall be available for the agricultural college of Utah until the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied, and shall so certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, that no trustee, officer, instructor, or employee of said college is engaged in the practice of polygamy or polygamous relations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will accept that amendment, so far as I can. It is new legislation, and I do not know but that some other gentleman will object.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I have just come into the Chamber and am informed that a matter relating to Utah is being considered. I ask for information concerning the question now before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again read the amendment for the information of the Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. KING. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is new legislation and not germane to the subject under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two reasons why the Chair would be inclined to overrule the point. In the first place it comes rather late, and in the second place the amendment seems to be a limitation upon this appropriation.

Mr. KING. If the Chair will pardon me for interrupting and seeming to question the rightfulness of the conclusions reached by him, I wish to say that I can not quite see upon what ground the point of order can be overruled.

With due deference for the opinion of the distinguished gentleman who occupies the chair, it seems to me that it can not justly or properly be contended that the point of order is too late in being suggested.

The amendment offered, against which the point of order is made, has just been read. The section of which it is amendatory has not been passed. No other matter has received attention. The amendment has not been acted upon. I can not state accurately the proceedings attending the offering of the amendment, for the reason stated, that I have just come into the Chamber, but I am told by gentlemen that nothing whatever occurred between the first reading of the amendment and the moment when I requested information respecting the matter before the committee. I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is seasonable.

As to the second point suggested by the Chair, it would seem that the amendment is rather a change of existing law than a limitation of the appropriation. I do not understand the rule to be that a mere direction as to the manner in which an appropria-

tion shall be expended is a "limitation," nor do I think that the reason or spirit of the rule is offended against by a provision in an appropriation which merely determines the class to which the appropriation shall be paid. I contend that this amendment is not such a "limitation" as is contemplated by the rule, that it is not germane, and that it is new legislation. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully insist that the point of order should be sustained.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a few words upon the amendment itself and the reasons prompting its introduction. From one standpoint I am not opposed to the amendment, but it has every appearance of not having been offered in good faith. Why did not the committee include it in the bill which they reported? Why defer this question until the last page of an important appropriation bill which relates to agriculture? Who proposed it? What influences are behind it? Why did not the committee examine into the question involved in this amendment, and permit those who are familiar with Utah and her people to be heard?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The committee did not offer the amendment. It was offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. KING. I am glad to know that this proposition did not emanate from the Agricultural Committee. However, my inquiries are still pertinent. Why was this matter precipitated upon the House in this summary and unceremonious manner? If any member had complaint against the manner in which the Agricultural College of Utah was conducted, why did he not invite the attention of the appropriate committee to the evils which he supposed existed, with a view to having the necessary investigation made?

Before members are called upon to vote to interfere with matters which, by legislation of Congress, have been left exclusively and unrestrictedly to the States there should be some good and sufficient reason. Personally, as I have said, I care but little about this proposed legislation. It is the manner and occasion in which it is offered, as well as the principle involved in its acceptance, against which I raise my voice and enter my earnest protest. I am not here defending polygamy or apologizing for any who may be living in polygamous association.

As I view the principle involved in this proceeding, we may well pause before writing such legislation upon our statute books. Mr. Chairman, let us examine, in a few words, the exact question presented. The Federal Government has united with the States and Territories in establishing experiment stations and colleges in which agriculture and the industrial and mechanical branches of education are taught. Annual appropriations are made by the General Government, and the States and Territories assume control of these institutions and appropriate liberally of State revenues for their maintenance. It is well known to all that the Federal appropriations have constituted but a small part of the entire amount expended in building up these splendid institutions of learning.

In the State of Utah the legislature has been appealed to in behalf of the Agricultural College, and the appeals have never been in vain. As a result of the generous policy of the State valuable lands have been acquired, commodious, costly, and magnificent buildings have been erected, and an institution of learning has been operated which has brought honor and glory to the State and credit to those into whose faithful guardianship its destiny was committed.

The proposition now is to depart from the policy of the past, to place in the hands of Federal officials inquisitorial and arbitrary powers, which are to be exercised in the control and management of the Agricultural College of Utah. What right has the Federal Government to say who shall be teachers and employees in any agricultural college? Is this the entering wedge to national control over our agricultural colleges? I deny the right of Congress to prescribe the qualifications of those who shall be connected with the agricultural college of any State. It would be unworthy of the Government to attempt such a control.

Mr. Chairman, the proposition is absurd. Think of the Federal Government "nosing" and "probing" around in all the States and Territories to ascertain who are the "trustees," "officers," "instructors," and "employees" in all the agricultural colleges. How the dignity of the United States and the majesty of law will be upheld and vindicated by conferring upon the Secretary of Agriculture judicial powers to find out the domestic virtues and vices of the employee who hoes beets upon the farm or woos the lacteal fluid from the meek-eyed cow complacently chewing her cud in the college barnyard.

The proposed amendment provides that "the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied" that no "trustee, officer, instructor, or employee is engaged in the practice of polygamy or polygamous relations." How is he to receive this satisfaction? Who is to satisfy him? Is he to be the judge and jury? Are all the officials of the college to be presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt? Are they to be tried if accused; and if so, by whom and under what rules of evidence?

Are persons to be deprived of property, viz, the emoluments of

the office and the right to employment, without due process of law or a fair and impartial hearing, after due notice of the charges against them and an opportunity to meet such charges? Mr. Chairman, the absurdity and, indeed, the wrongfulness of this proposition become more apparent as it is analyzed.

But why single out Utah? It is Utah to-day; to-morrow some other State may come under suspicion.

It is proposed now to limit the inquiry to "persons engaged in the practice of polygamy or polygamous associations." To-morrow the catalogue of crimes may be enlarged; the proscription may extend to those who are guilty of adultery, or any felony. And, after a while, if bigotry and intolerance shall prevail, the "socialists" and Christian Scientists may be placed upon the list. And, then, why may not persons who are opposed to trusts and criminal combinations of wealth be excluded from the agricultural colleges?

Mr. Chairman, illustrations might be multiplied indefinitely, if I had the time or inclination, to demonstrate how pernicious this amendment is. It will form a precedent which will be dangerous and unwholesome. If this proposition could be isolated, so to speak, and wholly disconnected from every other question and consideration, then a different matter would be presented.

c I again repeat, there is nothing before us to warrant such legislation.

It seems to me to be an affront to the governor of Utah and the good people of that Commonwealth. They are not here demanding this proposed legislation. The people of Utah are an industrious, law-abiding, patriotic people. In intelligence, education, industry, and all those elements which go to make up a sterling, rugged, progressive people they will bear comparison with older Commonwealths, and they measure up to the full stature of American citizenship.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing gratuitous about this at all; and in offering the amendment I do not intend to reflect in any way upon the people of Utah. I would say in this connection that less than a year ago I was a member of a special committee which went over a great deal of ground in investigating the credentials presented by the then member-elect from the State of Utah. I was furnished with the information at that time that the president of the institution located at Logan, Utah, was a polygamist and was living, in defiance of the law, with three wives; that one of his professors was a polygamist living in open and notorious polygamy with two wives; that the leading trustee was a polygamist, living in open and notorious polygamy with seven wives, who had blessed him within the neighborhood of thirty-nine children.

I have never received any information or any intimation of any kind from anybody living in Utah which has led me to change my opinion as to the truth of these statements. As a matter of fact, the statements were published in the Salt Lake Tribune, one of the leading papers of Salt Lake City. The editor of that paper challenged the official organ of the church to deny the statements then made, and, in so far as my information goes, the official organ of the church never entered such a denial. In fact, I was given to understand that one of the individuals named—either a professor or a trustee—thus charged, soon after the charge was made, resigned his position in connection with the institution, but I have been also informed that he has since taken up again his relations with the institution.

These charges, Mr. Chairman, have been made time and time again. It is no affront to the people of Utah. It remains to be seen whether the facts as stated are true or otherwise. If they are false, it is due to the good people of Utah that the world shall know that the charges are without foundation. If, on the other hand, the charges are true, then it is due to the people of the entire country that not a single solitary dollar shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States for the maintenance of that institution. I leave the proposed amendment in the hands of the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. SHATTUC. I raised the point and the gentleman is too late in making it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The Chair has already held that it is too late.

Mr. KING. I did not understand the Chair to definitely rule that the point of order was too late.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Chair said that the Chair was inclined to overrule the point of order for two reasons, one that it came too late and the other that this is a limitation simply put upon the appropriation.

Mr. KING. The confusion is such that I do not understand the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 63, noes 51.

Mr. KING. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 70, noes 44.

Accordingly, the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent that the section just passed, together with the amendment just adopted, be recurred to before the bill is finally reported, as I desire to offer an amendment to it. I ask that the section and the amendment be passed without prejudice to the offering of an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that the section just passed be recurred to at any time before the bill is reported.

Mr. LANDIS. I object.

Mr. KING. In view of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, which was thrown so suddenly upon the House, and the further fact that I have had no opportunity to prepare any amendment to his amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may return to this section and the amendment before the final passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman include opening up the amendment? Of course, it requires unanimous consent to amend this amendment.

Mr. KING. I desire to amend the section as amended. It will be in the nature of an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that before the bill is reported the committee return to this paragraph just passed and that the paragraph and the amendment just adopted both be open to amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman can make his point by demanding the yeas and nays on the amendment in the House just as well as to do this now, when possibly the members may thin out.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SHATTUC. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KING. I desire to offer an amendment. I have had no time whatever to prepare it, and I will be compelled to offer it extemporaneously, with the hope that the Clerk and Reporter can take it down. I move to amend this section, Mr. Chairman, by adding the following words:

And that no person shall be appointed a teacher or trustee in any of said colleges who has been engaged in any lynching and until proof shall have been furnished, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Agriculture, that such teacher or trustee has not been guilty of adultery or fornication.

Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Objection was made to going back, as I understand, by the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the observation of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman from Ohio objected to going back to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah was on his feet in time.

Mr. SHATTUC. I objected, Mr. Chairman, before he suggested that he was going to offer an amendment.

Mr. KING. We had not passed the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio objected to returning to the paragraph hereafter, but now the gentleman from Utah offers an amendment to the paragraph.

Mr. SHATTUC. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment, and then the gentleman can make his point of order, if he desires.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I want to see the amendment in writing, so I can tell what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it, and then it will be open to the point of order.

Mr. SHATTUC. I rise to the parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not the amendment reduced to writing yet.

Mr. SHATTUC. I do not care anything about the amendment now. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order will be in time.

Mr. SHATTUC. I have not raised a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHATTUC. I have, twice.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Chair did not understand it and asks the gentleman kindly to repeat it.

Mr. SHATTUC. I want to know the parliamentary situation. Have we not already agreed to the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Indiana?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee did agree to it, but the gentleman from Utah offers a further amendment to the paragraph, which is being reduced to writing.

Mr. SHATTUC. I withdraw my inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order against the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Utah, that it has not been presented in writing and that it is not the duty of the Clerk to reduce it to writing nor the duty of the committee to wait upon the gentleman to reduce it to writing.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the amendment has now been reduced to writing and the Clerk is ready to report it. The Chair overrules the point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the amendment just adopted the following:

"And that no person shall be appointed a teacher or trustee in any such college who has been engaged in any lynching, and until proof shall have been furnished to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Agriculture that such teacher or trustee has not been guilty of adultery or fornication."

Mr. GROSVENOR. A point of order; half a dozen points of order. [Laughter.] This is a general appropriation bill, and this is an expansion of the operation and not a limitation upon it. And it is, of course, new legislation. Beyond that and above that it undertakes to establish a rule of evidence by an amendment upon an appropriation bill; a rule of evidence that undertakes to say that the burden of proof, proof that he is not guilty, shall be upon the applicant for a position. Then I make to the Chair this proposition, that it is an entirety, and that a portion of it being beyond doubt out of order, it goes to the whole amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I will confess that if the Chair had not ruled that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] was in order I would join with my friend from Ohio in his contention. But it has just been decided that his amendment was not obnoxious to the rules, though it was offered to an appropriation bill. As I understand—

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state to the gentleman that the ruling on the other amendment was that that was a limitation upon the appropriation—providing that no part of this appropriation shall be paid to the agricultural college, in general terms, until it was ascertained that no teacher or trustee was a polygamist. That is a general statement of that amendment. That was a limitation upon the appropriation. Then comes this independent proposition, involving legislation.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that the amendment just suggested is a limitation as much as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. This amendment seeks to inhibit the payment of the appropriation, until it shall be determined that certain persons are not employed as trustees or teachers in the college. In principle there can be no difference between the two amendments when assailed by a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KING. I offer the following amendment. Amend by adding to line 2 on page 39:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the agricultural college of Utah or any other State or Territory until the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied and shall so certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that no trustee, officer, instructor, or employee of said college is engaged in the practice of polygamy or polygamous relations or is guilty of adultery or fornication.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I make the point of order that the same objection lies to this. That is making a duty, casting a duty upon the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the character of teachers in the institution out there; and not only that, but all over the United States.

The gentleman objected to the other amendment because it cast an aspersion against the teachers of the agricultural college in Utah. Now he seems to cast an aspersion against the whole people out there, but I am sure he does not mean this.

If the gentleman will argue this question like a lawyer, I will proceed with my argument. He moves a provision which casts a duty upon the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the character of all the teachers and trustees of all agricultural colleges throughout the United States. Is there any law requiring that now? If not, then it is new legislation, clearly and beyond doubt. Then he is to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, who, acting upon that certificate, is to pay the money thus appropriated in this bill to the agricultural colleges. It is not necessary to pursue the argument any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. A moment ago the gentleman from Indiana offered an amendment—

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules, I desire to eliminate from the amendment which I offered the words "and all other States and Territories," limiting it to Utah and Indiana. [Laughter.] In view of the fact that the amendment striking at Utah was offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] I think in fairness I should only seek to include Indiana.

Mr. SHATTUC. I object.

Mr. KING. So that it will read "Utah and Indiana."

The CHAIRMAN. A moment ago the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] offered the following amendment:

Amend by adding after line 2, page 39:

"Providing that no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Agricultural College of Utah until the Secretary of Agriculture shall be sat-

isfied, and shall so certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, that no trustee, officer, teacher, or employee of the State college has engaged in the practice of polygamy or polygamous relations."

And the Chair decided that that was in order as a limitation to the appropriation. There seems to be abundant precedents for that ruling. Now, this amendment is similar in character. It is a limitation to the appropriation. The only question in the mind of the Chair in reference to it is that it seems to modify the amendment already adopted. The committee has adopted one amendment in reference to limiting this appropriation, and this is another limit on the same appropriation.

Mr. KING. No, Mr. Chairman; it broadens it.

The CHAIRMAN. The only question the Chair has is whether this is not a modification of the amendment already adopted by the committee, offered by the gentleman from Indiana. It is the impression of the Chair, if that is true, that this amendment would not be in order, and upon that point the Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING. If there is any question in the mind of the Chair in respect to that matter, I desire permission to strike out the word "Utah" and insert the word "Indiana," so that it will not be subject to the objection that it is a modification or limitation of a proposition already affirmatively acted upon. Besides, Mr. Chairman, I will not be concerned if Utah is left out.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as modified. The Chair hears no objection, and in the modified form, in the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is in order. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a confession that I do not expect nor do I desire the amendment just offered to be adopted. It has not been my desire that any of the amendments which I have suggested should prevail. I tendered them for the purpose of accentuating the folly and absurdity of the proposition offered by my friend from Indiana, and thereby, if possible, calling the attention of members to the mistake which, in my opinion, was being made.

I am opposed to any interposition by Congress in the matter of the control of our agricultural colleges. If we adopt the precedent of having investigations instituted to ascertain the marital relations of employees in the agricultural colleges, why not widen the circle and pass upon their moral qualifications? If the Government is to inquire into their polygamous relations, why not ascertain whether they are living in adulterous association?

Mr. Chairman, these colleges are for the children of the various States and Territories. They are controlled by the people therein. It is un-American, unrepugnant, and indefensibly paternalistic for Congress to obtrude itself into these institutions of learning and say who shall be the employees or trustees therein.

I am not here to defend polygamy; nor would my constituents desire me to do so. Mr. Chairman, this specter of polygamy which is periodically paraded before the people of the United States need not frighten anyone.

As an institution among the people of the dominant church in the State of Utah, it is not only doomed, but it is dead. Long before the death of the century so reverently laid to rest but a few short days ago the hand of death was laid upon it. In good faith the Mormon people accepted the judgment of the people of this great nation upon this question. My friend speaks of the sentiment against the people of Utah because of the belief that this system is not abandoned. If there is such a feeling of resentment toward them it is unjust to the people of Utah.

Mr. Chairman, on the 24th day of July, 1847, a band of pioneers looked out upon the Dead Sea of the intermountain region. They were descendants of Revolutionary sires and Pilgrim fathers. They were seeking a land for their coreligionists—a land where they might have peace and rest. And then the exodus from the Mississippi Valley continued to this "promised land." Of their sufferings and sorrows, of their tears and woes, I need say but little. They speak more eloquently than my feeble voice. The wild and trackless plains were reddened by their bleeding feet, and the inhospitable deserts and frowning mountains welcomed them to cold and unmarked graves.

Invincible in their determination, heroic in their bearing, they met trial and peril and starvation and death. But they knew not fear or defeat and laid the foundations of a splendid Commonwealth. They laid unyielding hands upon the dry and sterile lands and compelled frowning nature to smile and unfruitful deserts to surrender rich benefactions. And they were Americans and loved the flag of their country. They unfolded our nation's banner upon the mountain heights of an unconquered and uncaded land.

Admission into the Union was sought not once, but time and time again. From the growing East thousands found their way to this new land and contributed their full portion to the growing State. The mountain streams were turned upon the parched land, the system of modern irrigation was established and given to the world, industries were developed, the mountain fastnesses were

struck by the strong arm of the rugged and fearless miner and there leaped forth the stream of mineral wealth that enriched not only the people of Utah, but all classes within our nation's border; cities were founded, schoolhouses builded, and a mighty State erected.

Mr. Chairman, it is a people who have done all these things and more who are now assailed. They are a part of this nation; they are bone of its bone and blood of its blood. For its advancement and glory they would esteem as naught the greatest sacrifice. This Government is by them regarded as God's patrimony to His children, the legacy of His love, the imperishable crown upon Liberty's brow that will shine with ineffable splendor until the coming of the "perfect day."

The people of my faith—of the dominant church in Utah—do not desire isolation. They want to stand side by side with the loyal, patriotic citizens of our land, meeting with courage the problems of the hour, the dangers of the years, and the full responsibilities of the most glorious citizenship the world has ever seen.

We have had and still have our local differences and domestic infelicities. But the years bring a better understanding; peace is in our midst; fraternal affection binds us together, and with confidence in the future the people of Utah—Mormon and Gentile—hail the coming day.

I beg of my friends not to look askance upon us, not to constantly point to Utah as something different from the rest of the Union. In this request I speak for all classes of this fair young State. Can not my Republican friends commit to the hands of the Republicans in Utah the management of this institution of learning?

Do not affront the Republican governor of Utah and the Republican board which has control of the college.

In the adoption of my friend's amendment there is an implied condemnation of the governor of my State, and this I resent. I desire to testify to the high character and standing of Governor Heber M. Wells. No more patriotic man can be found within the Republican party. He loves his State, and her welfare and good name are dear to him. The persons named by him to manage the Agricultural College stand high in the esteem of all classes.

Non-Mormons as well as Mormons were appointed upon the board. They have given loyal service to the institution. They have lovingly watched its growth and increasing power for good, and to-day the Agricultural College of Utah ranks with any similar institution in the Union. Is it fair or just to now assail this institution and to attack the earnest, faithful officials whose labors have contributed in such a remarkable degree to the perfection of this important educational institution? And is it right to affront the people of Utah, to single them out, and make them the subjects of undeserved and undesired notoriety?

If my friend from Indiana feels that a crusade should be inaugurated against polygamy, let him bring forth a proper measure dealing broadly with the entire subject as a separate and complete proposition, and I promise him that if no rights of the sovereign States are invaded the gentleman from Utah and the people of Utah will offer no opposition and will support such legislation as will satisfy the conscience and judgment of the honest, patriotic people of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, about a year ago there was very great excitement throughout the United States growing out of the allegation that was made that certain Federal officers in the State of Utah were polygamists, and that they had been appointed by a Republican Administration. That agitation came up in connection with, or contemporary in point of time with, the discussion in regard to the seating of the member-elect from that State. The House of Representatives, acting with promptness, did what it could to remove the stigma from the State of Utah by the rejection of their member of the House, and they seemed to acquiesce in the action of the House by sending here a member very acceptable, so far as any question of that character could be raised.

But it was thereupon widely circulated throughout the United States that the crime of polygamy was not only not exterminated in Utah, but that it was growing in power, growing in the number of persons engaged in the practice, and growing by the extension of their power over the adjoining States. So strong has grown this prejudice or this feeling—call it what you may—that within a few days a great assemblage of people in the eastern portion of the country received letters of instruction from men like ex-Senator Edmunds, and proceeded to urge again upon Congress the adoption of a constitutional amendment.

I ought to say that following immediately upon the excitement growing out of the Roberts case a constitutional amendment was offered here, and I for one opposed it—did what I could to have it defeated—because I do not approve of constitutional amendments as remedies for all the evils and ills that grow up in this country. I believe that statute law ought to take care of the crimes of the country rather than constitutional provisions, and especially constitutional provisions that are ingrafted upon the law of the land in such excitement as there was in the Roberts case.

Now, for our action on that question myself and many others were sharply criticised; and a very distinguished man—distinguished by himself at least; a representative of one of the Protestant churches of that State—through the newspapers, not only of Utah, but of my own Congressional district, abused me shamefully and persistently—almost as much as the Representative from Utah has done to-day—because I opposed the constitutional amendment; and it was said that the power of polygamy had finally dominated the House of Representatives. I did not observe that the effect of that gentleman's abuse was very serious in the fall of last year.

Now, what has happened here? With this feeling all over the country, we come up to this proposition introduced by the Representative from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]. I am not responsible for its introduction, but I must vote for it. The gentleman from Utah says that there is no such thing as polygamy in Utah. Then who is to be harmed? Is it injurious to the people of Utah to make a suggestion that at some time there was polygamy there? The gentleman knows perfectly well the history of his own State; the world at large knows that history, and while I accept his statement that the opposition of the church in Utah is being hurled against the further practice of this crime, nevertheless there is that prejudice among the people of this country that would drive us here in the House of Representatives to be at least very careful lest we come again under the suspicion that we are unwilling to do anything by constitutional amendment or otherwise to put the seal of our condemnation upon the crime of polygamy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now comes the suggestion that Indiana shall be named in this provision on the subject of polygamy. Was there ever polygamy in Indiana? I never heard of it. Were there ever polygamous marriages among the officials of the Agricultural College of Indiana? I never heard of it. Does the gentleman from Utah say that there never was a polygamist in power or in office in the Agricultural College of Utah? If he will say that, the two situations are alike. But if he will not say it—and knowing him as I do, I know he will not say it—then it becomes manifest at once that the two States in their condition in this respect are wide apart.

This is all I desire to say. I do not vote for this amendment with any view to assailing the people of Utah. I protected them so far as I could in the progress of the matters that have come before the House, and I rejoice with the gentleman from Utah and with all civilization that Utah is improving. But now that this question has come here, I do not see how we can avoid the issue. And as to this amendment of the gentleman from Utah, unless he will say that it has some application, that it is in some way pertinent, that there is some purpose to be achieved beyond the mere shaking of the legislative fist in the face of Indiana, I surely will vote against the amendment.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire accord with nearly everything that has been said by the gentleman from Utah. I voted with him against the resolution offered by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]. I voted against it because I did not believe it fair to stab the character of the people of Utah without any opportunity on their part to be heard. If any gentleman has any charge to make and desires an investigation, I will vote for it. I will go further. If the constitutional amendment is presented, I will vote for that. But on an appropriation bill, when there is no charge and no opportunity of a hearing by the people of the State of Utah, to make this insinuation is unfair. I do not believe in making public sentiment in any such way. Hence I voted against the resolution.

I approved the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah when I thought it had a legitimate purpose, the purpose being that he might be heard for a few minutes in defense of that educational institution in his State and the people who could only be heard through him. After he has done that I think the amendment has served its full purpose, and I beg the gentleman, quoting his own language when he says the resolution offered against the institution in Utah is an affront to that institution and to all the people of the State—I beg him to remember that his resolution now, if he persists in it, becomes as much of an affront to the people of Indiana and to that noble institution, the Agricultural College of Indiana—not situated in my district, but over at Lafayette—whose professorship is above suspicion, where over 1,000 bright young men and women are being educated; and I know the gentleman from Utah would not by this resolution cast any suspicion either upon the people of the State of Indiana or the professorship of that great institution or the young people receiving their education there.

For that reason I beg the gentleman, unless he desires to cast such an insinuation—the resolution having served his purpose, and

he having been permitted to make his speech—I ask him to withdraw the resolution and not cast this unjust insinuation because perchance he and one of the Representatives from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] may have crossed swords on the subject of the original resolution. If he insists on the amendment, I hope this House will vote it down without a dissenting vote.

Mr. KING and Mr. WADSWORTH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I will yield to either gentleman who desires it.

Mr. KING. I thought the gentleman had concluded.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I have no desire to proceed further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the pending paragraph be closed.

Mr. KING. I would like a little additional time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I trust the gentleman from New York will listen to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, we have done so two or three times already, and I think we had better proceed with the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I move to strike out of the amendment of the gentleman from Utah the word "Indiana" and insert the words "any State."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first put the motion of the gentleman from New York that debate be closed upon the pending paragraph, which includes amendments to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Now, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "Indiana" and inserting "any State." I will briefly state that I offer no affront—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that under the order of the committee no debate is in order.

The Clerk will report the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "Indiana" and insert the words "any State."

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The question recurred on the amendment proposed by Mr. KING. Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes on this amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment I have just offered.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been voted down.

Mr. KING. I thought the question was on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. No; both of the amendments were voted down. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Irrigation investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the laws and institutions relating to irrigation and upon the use of irrigation waters, with especial suggestions of better methods for the utilization of irrigation waters in agriculture than those in common use, and for the preparation, printing, and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation; and the agricultural experiment stations are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out said investigations in such manner and to such extent as may be warranted by a due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States and Territories as may be mutually agreed upon, \$50,000.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this not in the way of attempting a criticism on the appropriation made in this paragraph of the bill, but for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the alarming condition in which we find ourselves in the various appropriation bills on the subject-matter of this paragraph of the bill.

I find that the river and harbor bill was sought to be amended by a paragraph proposing not only the investigation of the irrigation question, but also the actual construction of reservoirs for the purposes of irrigation. The Indian bill comes back from the Senate with an important amendment on the same subject. We find that upon the sundry civil bill for many years we have undertaken an investigation of the same subject, and now again we find here upon the Agricultural appropriation bill a provision for the further investigation of this question.

I desire to call the attention of the House as briefly as I can to the history of this series of expenditures or experiments. We began them in 1888 by a law which directed the Geological Survey to make an examination of the arid regions of the United States as to the natural advantages they afforded for the storage of water for irrigation purposes. That was followed by the appropriation—by two appropriations, one for \$100,000 and one for \$250,000—which appropriations were also followed by a law which permitted the United States to withdraw from entry such part of the public lands as would be available for reservoir sites. And

under that provision of law—before it was repealed—many valuable sites for that purpose were withdrawn from entry.

That provision has now been repealed, but the authority on the part of the Geological Survey to continue the investigation still continues. We began in 1895, in the sundry civil appropriation bill, with an appropriation of \$12,500 for the investigation of this question. That has gone on from year to year, increasing, until in the sundry civil bill of last year we appropriated \$100,000 additional for the same purpose; and in the estimates submitted to Congress by the Department this year an appropriation of \$175,000 more is asked for. I do not know how much we have expended in the annual Agricultural appropriation bills. I do know, however, that some time in the nineties we began with an appropriation of \$6,000 for that purpose; and we find that appropriation has swollen so that it has become in this bill \$50,000. I think, first and last, we have probably appropriated for the purpose of investigation well up to a million dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not make any complaint, Mr. Chairman, of the investigation of this great subject. I do not undertake to say now that it is a work which the National Government should not undertake, but I do make this assertion, that if it is undertaken it should be undertaken after deliberation and in a manner by which Congress shall know exactly what it is doing.

Those who have studied the history of appropriation bills know very well how great undertakings have grown up with the simple foundation of a sentence in an appropriation bill. The great Library that we have across here began one hundred years ago by appropriating \$5,000 for a few books to be collected for the use of Congress. The Fish Commission began with an appropriation of a few thousand dollars, and the appointment of a scientific person for the purpose of considering the question of the propagation of fish. It has grown now so that the yearly bill for its support, not taking into account the lobster hatchery which my friend from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] established the other day, has grown to be \$500,000. These examples, which might be multiplied, call upon us to consider carefully the language of every appropriation bill and the tendency which every appropriation made by Congress has.

I do not at the present time say that this work ought not to be undertaken by the General Government, but I do say that we ought to stop these expenditures for mere investigation. We have investigated, investigated, investigated, and investigated again. Congress never can act intelligently upon a subject of this kind upon an appropriation bill. If we are to do this work at all, if we are to be led into the uncertainty of expenditure which it would undoubtedly bring about, then let it be done deliberately and intelligently. Let the Committee on the Public Lands, let the Committee on the Irrigation of Arid Lands, or let any committee which has jurisdiction of the subject-matter report a bill upon the question, submit it to the action of the House, and let there be deliberate action upon it. For one, I am done with these continued appropriations in different bills for investigation. No one knows when we shall be actually engaged in the doing of this work under language which may be concealed in the provisions of an appropriation bill.

Before we know it the country will be engaged in the execution of the work of irrigating the arid lands, without ever having deliberated upon it, without ever having determined upon it. It is time for us to cry "Halt!" upon these investigation, to cry "Halt!" upon these experiments which are merely a means devised to lead us to the adoption of a great policy, with an unmeasured burden of appropriation. I felt it my duty, having examined this subject somewhat, although I disclaim any convictions as to the merits—having examined the method of appropriation, I felt it my duty to call the attention of individual members of the House to a great question which within the near future we must face, and which we should face intelligently and not by indirection.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts has called attention to this question. I think myself that the time for action upon a comprehensive plan has arrived. I recognize the value of the investigations which have been going on regarding irrigation for the past ten or fifteen years, but the result of those investigations is that the Geological Survey is now in possession of the facts which enable it to present to the House of Representatives a comprehensive plan of action.

Of course examination and observation must go on with the work of construction. Appropriations for investigation and examination will be necessary in the future as they have been in the past; but the work of construction should, in my judgment, as in the judgment of all men who are informed upon this subject,

commence now. It has been delayed too long. The people of the intermountain region and the Pacific coast region have been clamoring at the doors of Congress for fifteen years for some action regarding the public domain, which embraces nearly a third of the area of the United States, the public domain in an arid or semiarid region, where the conditions with reference to agriculture differ from those prevailing in the public domain which has thus far been settled.

There the rains do not fall from the heavens upon the land and supply the moisture needed for cultivation of the soil. The snows fall upon the mountains, melt in the spring, and the waters coming from them are precipitated down the streams into the plains, and there are made use of for the purpose of irrigation. The difficulty is that the streams are swollen in the early spring, when water is least required, and are reduced to nothing in July and August, when water is most required.

The question is as to whether the Government will put its own lands into condition for settlement and cultivation by maintaining an equal and sustained flow of the stream by storing the water at the sources of the streams, holding it there on tap, and letting it out into the streams with scientific accuracy as it is required for agricultural purposes. Now, there are three ways of proceeding with this matter by Government enterprise.

One is to fashion a bill resembling the river and harbor bill. That bill has two classes of expenditures, one class involving simply the expenditure for the construction of public works upon rivers that have been projected by the Engineer Corps of the Army, with completed plans and estimates. The other class of expenditures provided for by that bill covers simply an investigation of the feasibility and practical worth of the project, accompanied by plans and estimates. Members of Congress, representing their districts, go to the River and Harbor Committee and present a project for a public improvement upon a river or harbor, and a survey is authorized by the War Department, to be accompanied by plans and estimates, which later on are acted upon by the committee and later on by the House in the shape of appropriations for actual construction.

Now, such a bill involves appropriations out of the public Treasury for putting the public domain into condition for settlement. We of the West insist upon it that it is a governmental measure warranting an appropriation from the General Treasury. I will not enter, however, into the details upon which we base this claim. I will come to the consideration of the other kinds of bills which embrace this subject.

Another form of bill is illustrated by the one presented by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], in which he proposes that the Government should make an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for four complete reservoir systems in each of the arid or semiarid States—thirteen in number—to be constructed under the direction of the Geological Survey, and providing that the lands subject to these reservoirs and to be reclaimed by them shall have an additional charge fixed upon them, which will be in a measure compensatory for the expenditure made. Another plan is this, and it is embodied in a bill—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Nevada be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Another plan, presented by a bill which I have introduced, absolutely relieves the Federal Treasury of any demand for appropriations. It provides that all the moneys coming from the sales of public lands in the arid or semiarid States shall go into and form a special fund in the Treasury, to be called the "arid-land reclamation fund," commencing with the proceeds of sales during the present fiscal year.

It then provides that the Secretary of the Interior, with the aid and assistance of the Geological Survey, shall make plans and estimates for the construction of storage reservoirs and hydraulic works, which estimate shall include the area that can be irrigated by them; that when the plan for a particular project is perfected and adopted by the Interior Department as feasible, the lands included in the reservoir sites and essential for the hydraulic work shall be withdrawn from general entry, and also that the public lands embraced within the area of the benefit of this particular storage system, subject to reclamation from it, shall also be withdrawn from general entry, and shall only be subject to entry under the act.

The act then provides that contracts for the work shall be let either for the whole or part, and that no contracts shall be let unless money sufficient for payment is then in the arid-land reclamation fund; that when the project is completed, the entire cost shall be ascertained and fixed pro rata upon the acreage benefited, and that the lands may be entered under the homestead law in tracts not exceeding 80 acres, and that water rights shall be sold at

a price compensatory, when all the land is entered and the water rights are sold, of the amount expended upon the storage system. The water right is to be paid in ten equal annual installments by the settler.

The bill also provides that no man shall be entitled to enter more than 80 acres, and that a less amount may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, according to the character of the land—its richness, fertility, and adaptability to certain forms of intense cultivation. It provides also that if there is more water than is required for the public lands—and there are lands within reach in private occupancy subject to this reclamation scheme—that the occupants of these lands can secure water rights at the same price as that paid by the settler, payable also in ten annual installments, with a provision also that no occupant of private lands can secure a water right for more than 80 acres.

The purpose of the bill is to prevent the monopoly of land in the settlement of public lands, and also to prevent these great tracts of land now under private ownership from obtaining water rights from the Government which will encourage monopolistic holdings. It inaugurates the policy which will make it to the interest of the holders of large tracts to divide them up into small farms of 80 acres, in order that the purchasers may avail themselves of the act and secure water rights. It does not compel the settlement of these large tracts which have been secured under improvident laws, but it makes it to the interest of their owners to divide them up. The aim of the act is to prevent monopoly of every form, to open up the public domain to actual settlers who desire homes, and to disintegrate the monopolistic holdings of land that prevail on the Pacific coast and in the intermountain region.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. How would it strike the gentleman from Nevada as a governmental policy to appropriate out of the Treasury money for the reclaiming of wet lands that are fertile in other States?

Mr. NEWLANDS. If these lands are public lands, there can be no question about the wisdom of it. If it is necessary, as in the case of the arid land, in order to promote settlement the Government, like any other owner of land, is warranted in pursuing a policy that will promote the utilization of its lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time of the gentleman will be extended two minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It would be entirely proper if these swamp lands were public lands. It would be the duty, the right, and the obligation of the Government to put these public lands in condition for settlement.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman recognizes that there are millions of acres of such lands in the country, and this same Government policy would carry appropriations for those lands.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Government has time and again given large tracts to the States for reclaiming them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. For the States to reclaim them?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is another form of appropriation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Would the gentleman from Nevada take the arid lands and have them reclaimed by the States?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; we object to granting the arid lands to the States, and for this reason: We feel sure that the trust will be improvidently exercised by the State. Many States are too poor to enter upon the reclamation, and the result would be that the land would be improvidently granted and given over to these monopolistic holdings which now prevail. We claim that it is the aim of the Government to promote these small holdings for the small settlers.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think that the management of these arid lands would be more improvident and unintelligent under the State than by the action of Congress?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It seems to me that is a reflection upon the gentleman's own State.

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; it is not. It is simply a recognition of the fact that many of the arid States have neither the funds with which to commence reclamation or the scientific knowledge and information at their command essential to the provident utilization of the grant. It is a recognition of the fact that the Government, dealing with the entire public domain regardless of State lines, is better equipped to carry out a comprehensive plan than the State, which has to plan regarding streams whose sources are in an adjoining State, and thus beyond its jurisdiction and control, and of the fact that the very limitation of State lines will compel an improvident use of the grant.

It is a recognition of the fact that the Government has for

twenty years been training a body of scientific men in the Geological Survey for this very work—a corps unsurpassed in the world so far as regards education, scientific knowledge, and practical experience, and that it would be a blunder amounting to a crime to substitute for the accumulated experiences and intelligent and comprehensive work of this corps the inexperience of individual States and Territories operating under the most embarrassing limitations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the item under discussion is an appropriation of \$50,000 for the purpose of carrying on irrigation investigation in the Department of Agriculture. Whatever may be said with regard to appropriations which have been made in the past for irrigation investigation or survey by other branches of the Government, this item is properly on an agricultural appropriation bill, and, in my opinion, should not only remain here, but be largely increased.

One-third of the entire continental domain of the United States is arid, and in this region the Government owns 550,000,000 acres of land. Within this vast territory agriculture is carried on only by irrigation and under irrigation methods. This bill carrying appropriations for the Agricultural Department contains only this one item for the direct benefit of the people of one-third of the area of these United States engaged in agriculture by irrigation. The item, and the work carried on under the item, does not conflict in any respect with appropriations carried on other bills for the purpose of irrigation survey. The investigations carried on under this item are investigations relative to the use of water in agriculture. The investigations carried on by the item in the sundry civil bill are investigations relative to the water supply of the arid regions, one being an investigation of water supply above the irrigating canal and the other being an investigation and study of the use of the water after it flows from the irrigating canal.

It matters not, Mr. Chairman, what the future policy of this Government may be relative to the reclamation of the great arid West, whether that reclamation shall be accomplished by private effort, under State management, or by appropriations from the Federal Treasury, or, what is more probable, by a combination of these agencies. Whatever we may do with regard to the arid lands, this appropriation should always remain in this bill, because it is an appropriation for the investigation of the questions relating to agriculture under irrigation, and those questions will continue to arise for settlement until as a people we have completely mastered the ancient and intricate art of irrigation; and this work should go on no matter through what agency actual reclamation may be accomplished.

Mr. Chairman, years ago there was an effort made by the people of the West to secure the cession of the arid lands within the borders of the various States to those States. I am informed that that effort received but little encouragement within this body. We of the West have taken it for granted that it is the settled policy of the Government that those lands shall remain under Government control and shall not pass under the control of the States. We say, therefore, that if the Government is to retain its control over these lands and its ownership of them, then it becomes the duty of the Government to fit these lands for settlement; for certainly it will not be maintained for a moment by any man on this floor that a third of this continent should remain, so far as the greater part of its area is concerned, forever a desert.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes more. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not entirely agree with the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] touching the question of State ownership and control of the arid lands. I have so high an opinion of the people in the region in which I live and of their intelligence and their civic honesty that I believe they could be trusted to manage, and manage intelligently, the manifold and diversified questions of the development of their lands if the lands were ceded to the States, though I fully appreciate the fact that there are some questions of reclamation which would be difficult to settle in a satisfactory way with the lands under State control. But we have been told that the lands will not be ceded.

We have ceased the discussion of that question. I believe that if they were ceded they would be intelligently managed. I believe that the States themselves would by legislation provide slowly but surely for their reclamation and settlement and their division into small farms. But the requests of the people of the West in this direction having been refused, we now come before Congress, not in this item, for this item has no connection whatever with the question of Government aid in reclamation of arid lands—it is a proper item here whether the Government is to reclaim the arid lands or not—but speaking to the larger question as

to the future of the arid lands of the West, we say that if the National Government insists on continuing in control and ownership of these lands it is the duty of the National Government to make it possible for the people to develop them.

I for one do not believe that it is the province of the Government to actually reclaim the lands of the West by the construction of diverting and distributing works. But if the Government is to continue to own and control 550,000,000 acres of Western lands having little value except as values are placed on them by the application of water, then it becomes the duty of the Government to make all the water the Almighty provides in that region available for the purposes of irrigation by the conservation in storage reservoirs of the waters which now run to waste in times of flood and freshet. In my opinion this is a proper governmental expenditure, and an expenditure which this Congress, in my judgment, will some day undertake and must undertake if the development of the Western third of our country shall continue and the public lands remain in the ownership of the Government until passed into private ownership.

[Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], in speaking of this expenditure, must bear in mind that it is a general expenditure relative to agriculture in the arid part of the country. Therefore it does not involve the particular question of the Government reclamation. But the House and the country are now up to the idea of dealing with the great arid domain in some way. The Government will have to deal with it in some form. We have had Government officers in charge of this land now for nearly twenty years or quite that long. They have studied these lands, they have studied the history of like lands in every country in the world, and they tell me that there is no country on earth having such lands to any great extent that has not reclaimed them by government expenditure.

The Hydrographer of this Government tells me that Australia, India, Italy, and every other arid-land country has had this question to deal with. First, the citizens of those countries spent many millions of dollars in an attempt to solve the problem and failed. Then the government has taken it up and made it succeed splendidly. He tells me that Australia has just given up private enterprise in this direction as a failure, and the minister of that government corresponding as nearly as may be to our Secretary of State says that the American people have made a woful failure in their policy of dealing with the arid lands, and he has recently recommended the government of Australia to enter upon the arid lands of that country and put them in such shape that the people can handle them.

Now, I have never contended that the Government must run these great enterprises. What we insist upon is that the Government should find out these reservoir sites, which it is doing, and make estimates, and that it should build the reservoirs. Then, I say, put a price on these lands. I do not care if you put \$10 an acre upon the best of them, with a good, abundant water right, and let these poor home seekers have ten years, with annual payments of a dollar a year per acre on those lands, and let them pay the Government back. They can do this. And I would say to our friends in Massachusetts and in Pennsylvania that they will find reclamation will furnish them the cheapest and the best market they ever had. You can build up a market cheaper and you can find commerce cheaper and with less expenditure in the arid domain than in any other place in the United States or beyond the United States.

That land is valuable beyond calculation. You say, "Why do not the States take it?" I say to you these Western States have had a hard time since 1893. It has been almost impossible for the States having the greatest area of arid land to pay their running expenses and build all of their new State buildings and institutions. But, if a great government, having immense resources, would adopt a comprehensive plan, and, after doing what I suggest, would sell the land to citizens, including the water right, for \$10 an acre, payable \$1 a year for ten years, they could take care of that. In our part of the country they could. But no single citizen and no community of citizens can now go in and reclaim those arid lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. They tell me that in India the British Government, or the government of India, has spent over \$100,000,000 in reclaiming the arid lands there. Our friends seem to think that we out in that new country can make this reclamation. I want to state to you some of the difficulties with which we have to contend. We have had to build Statehouses, schoolhouses, asylums, county

and city buildings, roads, and bridges incident to a new country which has and will for years exhaust our resources.

You say, and rightly say, that we shall not permit these lands to be monopolized. Now, the only way the people of these arid regions can possibly reclaim these lands would be to turn it over to them and let them raise money on the prospective value of these lands when reclamation was completed. That has been attempted here, and has been attempted elsewhere; but the people of the United States are opposed to permitting these valuable lands to be monopolized. They realize that the cheapest government of this nation is in building homes throughout the arid regions of this country. Now, under the Carey Act, that is impossible. If the Carey Act had no limitations, if the Carey Act said that Colorado might reclaim a million acres of ground, that we might take the ground, that we might obligate the ground to pay the expenses, we might do it; but they require the State to advance the money; they require the State to first make the expenditure and take the lands afterwards.

Nevada, with all her hard luck, has more valuable lands than almost any other State in the Union, has water to apply to it, but she can not put a dollar in it; and the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, etc., are not in a condition to advance the money. And we say the Government owning these lands, the Government being interested now in building homes and planting its people on homes out of these choked-up cities—that it can well afford to go and put these lands in a shape that they will be subject to settlement and put an expense on the party taking the lands that is commensurate with the expenditures and let these lands be settled. Now, in my district there are two great streams where, by an expenditure of \$2,000,000, you could cover 200,000 acres of land. There is not an acre of that for which people will not be willing to pay \$1 per acre per annum for a period of ten years if you take that water out of the deep canyons and spread it on the splendid Uncompahgre and Grand valleys. They can not do it.

No corporations are going to do it, because the remuneration is too far off. The ditch which covers the little valley cost \$250,000, built by the Travelers' Insurance Company; but it is paying a small dividend, and they say there is not enough profit, that the investment is too slow to encourage capital.

Now we think, and think justly, that if these great arid-land States were around the thickly populated centers of this country there would be no question. Outside of Colorado and the arid West there is not one in a thousand who understands the conditions; but every Government officer that has had the matter in charge says there is but one way, and that is Government reclamation for the people, and it does seem that the judgment of such disinterested officials should be a trusty guide for our friends who have not studied these questions.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I withdraw the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public road inquiries: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make inquiries in regard to the system of road management throughout the United States; to make investigations in regard to the best methods of road making, and the best kind of road-making materials in the several States; the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere; and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; traveling, and other necessary expenses, and for preparing and publishing bulletins and reports on this subject for distribution, and to enable him to assist the agricultural colleges and experiment stations in disseminating information on this subject, \$20,000.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. In line 20, after the word "investigations," insert "and experiments." In line 5, page 41, strike out the word "twenty" and insert "one hundred and fifty."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I raise a point of order on that. It is new legislation and increases the appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will state the amendment, so that the Chair will understand it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 20, after the word "investigations," insert the words "and experiments;" on page 41, line 5, strike out "twenty" and insert "one hundred and fifty."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Carolina upon the point of order.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, this section of this bill provides an appropriation of \$20,000 for the purpose of experimenting in road building, in employing experts to look after, seek out, and find the best material in the sections where the roads are to be built in the States. This expenditure of \$20,000 in my judgment is not sufficient to accomplish the objects sought to be obtained. It will hire experts, establish a bureau of information, and probably equip an office, but it will not give one lesson in practical road building. What should be done is to not only furnish knowledge in road building, but to furnish means by which sample roads can be put in each State. My amendment provides that the appropriation shall be increased to \$150,000, instead of \$20,000.

The point of order can not lie. It is in accord with the section brought in by the committee providing for \$20,000 to be used in road experiments.

I want to say to the House, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriation of \$20,000 simply provides for a few experts and for a division in the Agricultural Department to examine the materials used in the different parts of the United States, without one dollar of appropriation for experimental work. Now, I hold that this whole provision ought to go out of this bill or we ought to appropriate \$150,000 and give some money for experiments. I say that if we employ these men and pay them their salaries, that there should be some provision made by which they can render some practical service to the people of the different States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman make a motion to strike out the appropriation?

Mr. LATIMER. No; I have moved to increase it to \$150,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Is that for the purpose of building a sample mile of road in each State in the Union?

Mr. LATIMER. That is the purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman think that is wise and in the line of good governmental policy?

Mr. LATIMER. If you appropriate \$20,000 only, which will mostly go in salaries to experts and make no provision to actually operate with, it is a waste of money. Either you should strike that section out of the bill or appropriate a sufficient sum to make experiments.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I wish the gentleman had made a motion to strike out the appropriation, but not to load it down in this way.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, will the Chair rule on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from New York to the last five lines on page 40 of the bill; that seems to provide for experiments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true, Mr. Chairman; I had forgotten that provision. Mr. Chairman, the committee, in the first place, has appropriated all the money estimated for by the Secretary of Agriculture—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will withdraw the point of order. The committee contends that all the National Government can do is to agitate the matter of good roads and, if I may use the word, preach economy of good roads; but I do not think they should go into any State or Territory and build even sample roads. That is a question that lies entirely with the locality. When you come to the end of the agitation, if you should cover the country with sample roads, it comes down finally to the ability of the people of the locality to tax themselves to build these roads.

There are very few localities in the country that are willing to tax themselves to the extent of three or five thousand dollars a mile to build roads. Further than that, a dirt road is the best road we can travel over for eight or nine months in the year. So when you build a road costing three to five thousand dollars a mile, a stone road, you build that for one-third or one-quarter of the year only. Therefore the matter comes directly to the ability of the locality to tax itself for these roads. What the Government ought to do is to preach good roads, the economy of good roads, and send men over the country to hold farmers' institutes, tell them all the facts, what the material is in certain localities, how it can be found, and how the roads should be made. I want to read an extract from a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture which he wrote to me on January 11:

I will assume the weight of responsibility in declining to appropriate \$150,000 for roads, or any other sum, extending our road building in the States, for the reason that we have no scientific working force fully organized for the investigation of road material.

In other words, the Secretary is not ready for this work. He claims he could not spend the money in a businesslike manner if he had it.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to ask the chairman of this committee if he thinks it is right and proper to appropriate \$20,000 to keep a few men in office, receiving good salaries, to go about the country and yet get no practical results?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I deny that statement. I say the little bureau established over there is doing a great deal of good. The Secretary has divided the country into four sections, has four road experts who travel over the country preaching good roads in these sections. One is composed of the Eastern States, one of the Southern States, one of the prairie States, and one of the Rocky Mountain States. These men are preaching good roads and doing good work all over the United States. They are doing a good deal of good, and I deny that they are not getting any practical results.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in reply to the chairman of the committee, that if the object of this appropriation is to aid in building good roads, then some adequate appropriation

should be put in the bill upon which to operate in the different States. If he thinks it is legitimate for Congress to pass an appropriation of \$20,000 to hire a few men to go over the country and preach good roads, then I want them not only to preach good roads but to actually practice road building, and to have the means by which they can give the people an object lesson.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is a matter I think the States ought to do.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LATIMER. Yes.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Have the Department officials promised the gentleman from South Carolina that if he would vote for this amendment they would build a sample road in his district?

Mr. LATIMER. I have no promise from the Department officials, and I repel the insinuation.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. That is all right. I do not accuse the gentleman of it. I only asked the question.

Mr. LATIMER. I am here to legislate in the interest of the people, and spurn your insinuation by that question. I am here contending that if we do not propose to appropriate more than \$20,000, which simply means pay for the salary of a few men—giving good offices to a few men—we ought to strike out that \$20,000. I hold that if we make the appropriation at all we ought to put a sufficient appropriation in the bill to build sample roads in each of the States of the Union, so that these gentlemen employed at good salaries may have some opportunity to show what they know about good roads and give an object lesson to the people of the different States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it has often been said that the reductio ad absurdum is, when pertinent and continuous, the best argument in logic. In considering any subject of importance it is very frequently well for us to ask ourselves some questions, and thereby solve a question. Let us in this case ask ourselves this question: If the idea advocated by the gentleman from South Carolina is adopted, how far is it to go, where will it stop, and when, and how? How long a sample of good roads shall you build in each State? How long shall they continue to be "samples" in each State?

If you build a mile as a "sample" in one part of each State, can the gentleman give me any reason under the sun why we should not build another mile for another sample in another part of the State where the soil is different? And when we have built 2 miles, can the gentleman give us any reason why we should not build a third in a third part of the State with yet a different sort of soil? Then can the gentleman give me any reason, after we have built 1 mile in each particular sort of soil in each State, why we should not make 2 miles in each soil in each State? And then can he give me any reason why there should not be 3 miles? And then can he give me any reason why the National Government should not go ahead and build all the roads? And then can the gentleman give me any distinction between this result at which we shall have arrived and Coxeyism itself? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I take it, the purpose of the pending amendment is to have experimentation. Now, I think it can not be seriously contended that it will do any great good for the Secretary of Agriculture to simply go around over this country and gather information as to how roads are being built and maintained. That information must necessarily be limited to the locations where experiments have been and are being made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman has a mistaken idea in his mind. The Secretary of Agriculture is not only engaged in gathering information, but also in spreading information.

Mr. FINLEY. I understand that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. These people go wherever they are called upon to go and act as supervisors of the work, showing people who are building roads at their own expense how to build them, what sort of material to use, what angles to make, how to drain the roads, and everything of that kind.

Mr. FINLEY. I understand that fully. But, after all, the Secretary of Agriculture, bound and limited as he is here, when he finds an appropriation of only \$20,000, can do nothing more, practically speaking, than to gather information as to the methods of road making in the State of Pennsylvania, South Carolina, or elsewhere in the United States. Any supervision by the Government agents under such circumstances would be perfunctory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it must be assumed, if this is all the Secretary of Agriculture should do, then it is true that the methods followed now in some of the States are the very best methods for road building and repair that can possibly be inaugurated. I say

that herein lies the fallacy of the argument of gentlemen who contend that this appropriation is sufficient.

From my standpoint there can be no greater undertaking on the part of the National Government than to inaugurate a system of investigation and experimentation which will give to the people of every part of the United States information, accurate and valuable, as to how good roads can be built with the least expenditure of money and economically maintained. Now, in some sections of the United States it may be that a dirt road on which is laid a covering of petroleum is the best, in another sand on clay, in another clay on sand, and in another a road with a bed of gravel and stone may be best.

So after all we seek here to do what is done in many other Departments of the Government—give the people of the United States the benefit of statistics based upon experimentation. I say it is folly to go around and gather information as to what has been done in certain localities unless it is proven that the experiments now being pursued in various States have reached perfection. I do not believe that it has. Therefore I am in favor of the amendment—

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman permit me an inquiry?

Mr. FINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does not my friend think that if we should make elaborate appropriations for road experimentation, as he calls it, the people after a while will begin to ask the Federal Government to build the roads?

Mr. FINLEY. I do not. Road building must necessarily be by the States. Napoleon the Great has been given more credit than any other man who ever lived in France for making that nation what it has been and is; and the fact that he gave to France better roads than any other nation of the world in his day, in my opinion, made it possible for him to accomplish his great undertakings to the extent he did.

Mr. KING. Does my friend see any parallel between Napoleon Bonaparte's Government and our Republic, where we have a Federal Government of limited powers, with States exercising the residue of power?

Mr. FINLEY. I say that wherever experimentation is necessary for the best interests of the whole country, and it can not be carried on efficiently by individuals or States, it should be taken up by the General Government whenever it has the power and authority to carry on the work.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word. The purpose of this appropriation is, I think, in line with the views of the director, as stated in a letter from him and as shown in an official statement of the expenditures of this sum of \$150,000.

Detailed estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

Ordinary expenses—salaries, office, and traveling	\$25,000
Salary of director	3,000
Two stenographers, \$1,200 each	2,400
Salaries and expenses of 8 special agents, \$2,000 each	16,000
Eight road experts, \$1,800 each	14,400
Traveling expenses and subsistence of experts, \$500 each	4,000
Eight practical road builders, \$1,200 each	9,600
Four scientific aids, \$480 each	1,920
Pan-American Exposition	1,000
South Carolina and West Indian Exposition	1,000
Machinery for object-lesson road building	20,000
Experiments	2,000
Sample roads in each State	45,000
Laboratory for the testing of road materials:	
Incidental expenses	1,000
Expert in charge of laboratory	2,000
Freight on machinery for object-lesson roads	2,000
Total	150,320

These are the expenditures as detailed by an officer of the Government who is seeking to get the aid of the members of this House for the project of constructing "object-lesson" roads in the various States. I submit that such roads can be discounted by experts in every State, and that the construction of roads within the States should be carried on under State, not under national, authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read—I mean the entire section.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 33, noes 64.

So the motion to strike out was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in the city of Washington and elsewhere; transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, \$170,000, of which amount not more than \$33,000 shall be expended for labor in the city of Washington, D. C., of which

sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available, and not less than \$90,000 shall be allotted for Congressional distribution.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all that portion of the bill beginning with line 10, page 41, and ending with line 17, page 44.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that includes a portion of the paragraph which has already been passed and a portion not yet read.

Mr. CORLISS. I refer to the paragraph relating to the purchase and distribution of seeds.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman's motion would relate to line 19 and to the end of that paragraph.

Mr. CORLISS. Very well. Then I ask that the amendment be corrected to conform to that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will make the necessary corrections.

Mr. CORLISS. I do not care, Mr. Chairman, to occupy the time of the committee in discussing it, but I contend that this provision ought to go out of the bill. As an illustration of the evil effect of the paragraph, I call your attention to a letter from the Agricultural Department written to me to-day—or under date of the 28th day of January and received to-day. He says:

I have the honor to state that 25 quart packages of sorghum seed will be placed for distribution in your city.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what earthly good is the distribution of sorghum seed in a municipal district like mine? Where would the people plant them?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman might succeed in trading them off for other seed or for documents which could be distributed where these particular seeds are not needed.

Mr. CORLISS. Well, I am not in the trading business. I am not in the junk trade. I do not desire to trade in matters of this kind. I go to the Department and ask a portion of the seeds for my district, such as the people would like to have and such as would be of some value to them, and the request is declined and other seeds allotted to me that are of no practical use at all. I submit that the appropriation should stop.

Again I call your attention to the fact that the appropriation for the last five years has been increased \$70,000 a year. You can go on, if you desire. I simply desire to enter my objection to this legislation.

Mr. BROMWELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, just a word. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] Oh, you may call for votes as much as you please. I ask to be heard.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Wait until the vote is taken on this proposition.

Mr. BROMWELL. I can sit here as long as gentlemen crying "Vote!" I can stay here as long as they can. I propose to be heard.

As to the criticism of the gentleman from Detroit [Mr. CORLISS] in regard to being unable to get the kind of seed he wants for his district, I propose to reply to him by citing an amendment I shall offer at the proper time and wish to have read now for the information of the House, and they can think it over for a few minutes before the vote is taken. I have had the same difficulty of which the gentleman complains. I represent a city and an agricultural district combined. And yet the appropriation of last year made practically worthless my quota.

I got 8,800 garden seeds for distribution among from four to five thousand of my agricultural constituents, while I got 400 packages of flower seeds to be distributed among about 125,000 people. I propose to offer, at the proper time, an amendment which I ask to have read, and because I think it will be seen to be a proper amendment. The same proposition was enacted in the Senate some years ago, and I ask the insertion of the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 1, page 44, after the word "represents," the following: "And provided further, That the relative proportion of vegetable, flower, and other seeds allotted to any district shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the written request of the Senator or Representative of such district, filed with him at least sixty days prior to the time of advertising for the purchase of said seeds."

Mr. BROMWELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in this bill that the quotas sent to the different Members and Senators shall be equal in value. This amendment which I propose to offer does not interfere with that, but it does permit any Member or Senator, sixty days before the time for the advertisement for the contracts for these seeds, to indicate in writing to the Secretary of Agriculture what proportion of vegetable seeds he wants, what proportion of flower seeds, what proportion of tobacco or other seeds placed in the different quotas. Under this provision a

city district represented by a member on this floor can obtain flower seeds of equal value with the vegetable seeds distributed to a gentleman representing an agricultural district. Or, if you represent a district that contains both city and farming constituents, you can call for half flower seed and half agricultural seed, or in any other proportion that you choose to put it. Now, these written requests going in sixty days before the advertisement for the proposal will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to determine by a very little calculation, which any clerk can make inside of forty-eight hours, the different proportions of seeds required.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Does the gentleman's amendment say sixty days?

Mr. BROMWELL. Sixty days before the advertisement for the proposals. That gives ample time to make that request of the Secretary and to have the tables made up so that he will know exactly what to do, what kind of seeds will be required; and at the proper time I shall ask to have this amendment considered. I hope that no member of the House will raise the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Ohio that the proper way would be to perfect the text of the paragraph before voting on the motion to strike it out.

Mr. BROMWELL. It is not an amendment to this section. It is a section farther along, to which I will offer it at the proper time.

Mr. MORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to line 20, page 41, and to line 11, page 42, and to line 18, page 43.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that some of these amendments relate to paragraphs which have not yet been read. The bill has been read down to and including line 8, page 42.

Mr. MORRELL. Very well; I will wait until the paragraph is reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The first amendment relates to a paragraph which has been read. The Clerk will report that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 20, page 41, after the word "valuable," insert the words "and rare."

Mr. MORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the distribution of seeds and bulbs, but I am not in favor of the distribution of some 24,000,000 packages of ordinary seeds. I am willing even to vote for the suggestion made by the gentleman from South Carolina to double the appropriation, for the reason that I believe anything that brings the great farming element, which he so nobly defended, into closer relations with the Federal Government is a good thing. It does not increase paternalism, but increases patriotism. I think, however, Mr. Chairman, that we have departed from the original intent on of the Government in the distribution of seeds. It was evidently the intention of the Government that such seeds should be distributed suitable to different localities which could not be obtained by those living there.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest to the gentleman that he use the word "new" instead of "rare." The original act used the word "rare," and if seeds are new they will be valuable.

Mr. MORRELL. Well, I will accept the amendment, so that it will read, "new and valuable."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to modify his amendment.

Mr. CORLISS. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the word "rare" was in the act as originally passed.

Mr. MORRELL. The gentleman from Michigan suggests that the word "rare" was in the original act. That is exactly what I want to impress upon the members of this House, that we are not following out the intention of the Government when we distribute ordinary vegetable seeds and garden seeds. I think I prefer to have my amendment stated in the original form.

Mr. LATIMER. Before we vote on the motion to strike out—

Mr. MORRELL. I am not aware that I have yielded the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought the gentleman had yielded the floor. The gentleman has two minutes left.

Mr. MORRELL. I should like simply to state that in the distribution of rare seeds we not only encourage the growers of seeds, but we encourage those to whom we send them. We increase their enthusiasm in the pursuit of agriculture and they are anxious to vie with each other in seeing what those seeds will produce. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. For the reasons which I have stated, I should like to have the word "rare" inserted after the word "valuable."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, in line 20, page 41, after the word "valuable," the words "and rare."

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this section, in line 3, on page 42, to strike out "one" and insert "two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that amendment is in order until the other amendment has been voted on.

Mr. LATIMER. My understanding was that we were to perfect the paragraph before the motion to strike out was voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. A motion has been made to strike out. Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania has moved to amend the text. That takes precedence. After that is voted on, the amendment of the gentleman will be in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move to close all debate on the motion to strike out and on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What is the motion?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The motion of Mr. CORLISS.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to close all debate on the paragraph and amendments.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORLISS. I would like to accept that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You can not accept it.

Mr. KING. I ask that the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion to strike out.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to offer an amendment to the section, Mr. Chairman. On page 42, line 3, strike out "one" and insert "two;" page 42, line 4, strike out "thirty" and insert "forty;" in line 7 strike out "ninety" and insert "one hundred and eighty."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 42, line 3, strike out "one" and insert "two;" in line 4 strike out "thirty" and insert "forty;" in line 7 strike out "ninety" and insert "one hundred and eighty."

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment. All debate has been closed on the paragraph and amendments.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LATIMER. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 55, yeas 74.

Mr. LATIMER. Tellers, Mr. Chairman!

The question was taken, and tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York, Mr. WADSWORTH, and the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. LATIMER, will act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 59, yeas 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CORLISS. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 38, yeas 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seed so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds, suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States. An equal proportion of two-thirds of all seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the Department upon the receipt of their addressed franks; and the person receiving such seeds shall be requested to inform the Department of the results of the experiments therewith: *Provided*, That all seeds, bulbs, plants, and cuttings herein allotted to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution remaining uncalled for on the 1st of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress, and who have not before, during the same season, been supplied by the Department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts em-

braced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-second parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery on the 10th day of January, or at the earliest practicable time thereafter: *Provided further*, That \$20,000 of the sum thus appropriated, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used to collect, purchase, test, propagate, and distribute rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries for experiments with reference to their introduction into this country; and the seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants thus collected, purchased, tested, and propagated shall not be included in general distribution, but shall be used for experimental tests, to be carried on with the cooperation of the agricultural experiment stations.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I referred to a few moments ago, and which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, in line 1, page 44, after "represents," the following:

"*Provided further*, That the relative proportion of vegetable, flower, and other seeds allotted to any district shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the written request of the Senator or Representative of such district filed with him at least sixty days prior to the time of advertisement for the purchase of such seed."

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is necessary for me to add anything to what I have already said. It is entirely practical and permits each member to indicate to the Secretary of Agriculture just what he wants in the distribution of these seeds. If one member wants all agricultural seeds, he can get it; if he wants to get all his quota in flower seeds, he can get that; or if he wants to get one part of it one and one part of it the other, he can get it that way by sending this written request to the Secretary of Agriculture sixty days prior to the advertising for the contract.

Mr. HULL. One question. Suppose that the Representatives forget to write to the Secretary of Agriculture. Where are they?

Mr. BROMWELL. Then he would distribute them just as he does now. This permits Members or Senators to do it this way. They are not compelled to do it, and if they do not do it he can distribute the seed just as now, according to his discretion.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? [Cries of "Vote!"] Does your amendment give you the right to ask the Secretary of Agriculture to give you a particular kind of seed?

Mr. BROMWELL. It does not.

Mr. GAINES. It leaves him entirely at liberty in that.

Mr. BROMWELL. Just as he is now entirely at liberty. The only thing is this: You say, I want seven-tenths of my quota in vegetable seed, two-tenths in flower seed, and one-tenth in tobacco seed; or you say, I want ten-tenths in vegetable seed, ten-tenths in flower seed, or in any other proportion you choose. All that is necessary to carry out this matter will be for the Secretary of Agriculture to send out to each member a blank, "Please notify the Department on this blank the proportion of vegetable, flower, and other seed you desire in the next allotment," and then have a blank of the allotment in tenths, and he could go on and give in one line flower seed, in another vegetable, tobacco, or lawn grass, or whatever he seeks, on each line; and when you have it filled up, send it to the Secretary of Agriculture, and the clerks go to work and send them out. They are to be equal in value, so that no one gets any advantage over another. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the gentleman from Ohio has forgotten one important fact in connection with his amendment. These various seeds are of various prices as well, and in proportion as gentlemen from the cities call for an increased allotment of high-priced flower seeds—for example, calling for seven-tenths of their allotment to be in flower seeds—the amount left to be devoted to the purchase of garden and field seed is decreased. The Secretary has a certain amount of money only with which to buy all seeds, and therefore he will be required to buy less seeds than he does now, as more tobacco, flower, and other higher priced seeds are purchased. Just in proportion as he is compelled by this call or allotment to buy higher priced seeds he is compelled to buy less of the lower priced seeds. Now, these lower priced seeds are vegetable seeds, which are of utility.

Mr. BROMWELL. What utility are they in the cities or suburban districts?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will come to that in a moment; let me finish what I was saying. So the effect of the gentleman's amendment will be to reduce the quota, both in value and amount, of gentlemen who come from the rural districts, who need garden seed, by taking a larger share for members who come from the city districts—i. e., a larger share in money value.

Now, the gentleman complains that the city districts do not get the benefit of the seed distribution. As far as I am concerned, I never have seen why they should send vegetable seeds to the city districts at all. This is a distribution supposed to be for the benefit of agriculture. There is no agriculture on the Bowery in New York; there is no agriculture on the streets of Chicago. I think one improvement that ought to be made is to cut off the quota of garden and field seed that goes to the cities altogether.

Mr. BROMWELL. In every one of the cities there are plenty

of homes that have a little garden spot in front, or in the rear, where they use flower seeds, but they can not use beans or corn—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But the gentleman would get his flower and lawn-grass seed, and can exchange his corn and beans now, with present methods, for lawn-grass and flower seeds with gentlemen from the rural districts.

Mr. BROMWELL. I have a hundred packages of tobacco seeds and I have not a tobacco grower in my district. I have turned it into the Agricultural Department, to go to other districts where they do raise tobacco.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this paragraph be closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROMWELL) there were 33 ayes and 77 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to make such further reorganization of his Department as will in his judgment be conducive to the interests of the public service: *And provided further*, That the total expenditure shall not exceed the aggregate amount hereby appropriated.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order on that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to be heard, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be heard.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts state what is his point of order?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It changes existing law by conferring authority on the Secretary of Agriculture which he has not now.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will refer the Chairman to the original act, section 4, chapter 72, of the Revised Statutes at Large, 1863:

Sec. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That the Commissioner of Agriculture shall appoint a chief clerk, with a salary of \$2,000, who, in all cases during the necessary absence of the Commissioner, or when the said principal office shall become vacant, shall perform the duties of the Commissioner—

Now here is what I want to call particular attention to—and he shall appoint such other employees as Congress may from time to time provide, with salaries corresponding to the salaries of similar offices in other Departments of the Government; and he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons, for such time as their services may be needed, including chemists, botanists, entomologists, and other persons skilled in the natural sciences pertaining to agriculture.

The act is just as broad as the heavens are high and the earth is deep.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the act says "as Congress may from time to time provide." How can Congress provide except by legislation?

Mr. LIVINGSTON (reading)—

The Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized to employ in the Department assistants and other persons and to fix their pay and compensation from various general appropriations made in the acts making appropriations, etc.

That power is already given him by law; my amendment simply recites the fact here at the close of the bill. The act of March 3, 1893, repeats the provision of the original act on this subject. The only effect of my amendment is to give the Secretary discretionary power to arrange his officers in the different bureaus within the appropriations already provided in the bill. It does not change the appropriations. It can not change the law. The law now gives him that latitude. My amendment simply makes it specific in this particular place. The gentleman has made a point of order in my opinion without knowing—I say it with all respect to him—anything about the original act which constituted this Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the committee rise and report the bill and amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the bill as amended be passed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There was one paragraph passed yesterday on which a point of order was reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the recollection of the Chair, the point of order was sustained.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The provision to which I refer is on page 8. That paragraph was to be returned to.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair thinks there was a paragraph to be returned to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think that is right. The paragraph to which the gentleman refers is:

For the purchase of a site and the erection of a small brick and wood building at each of the following-named places, for use of the Weather Bureau,

and for all necessary labor, materials, and expenses, plans and specifications to be prepared and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and work done under the supervision of the Chief of Weather Bureau, namely: Atlantic City, N. J., \$6,000; Hatteras, N. C., \$5,000, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. That paragraph, according to the recollection of the Chair, went out on a point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I explained the matter this morning to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] who made the point of order. These items are simply in some cases for the repairs of old buildings and in some cases for the construction of new buildings for the use of the Weather Bureau. They are absolutely necessary for the proper administration of that Bureau. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will withdraw his point.

Mr. CORLISS. In view of the explanation of the gentleman from New York, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws the point of order, and, without objection, the paragraph will be considered as reinserted in the bill. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I renew my motion that the committee rise and report the bill as amended to the House with the recommendation that it pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13801) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, had directed him to report the same back with several amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended passed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to; and the previous question was accordingly ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. KING. I ask a separate vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the vote will be taken on all the other amendments in gross.

The question being taken, the amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the exception of that on which Mr. KING demanded a separate vote, were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is now upon the amendment on which the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] has demanded a separate vote. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding, after line 2, page 39, the following:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Agricultural College of Utah until the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied, and shall so certify the Secretary of the Treasury, that no trustee, officer, instructor, or employee of said college is engaged in the practice of polygamy or polygamous relations."

The question being taken, there were on a division (called for by Mr. KING)—ayes 19, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WADSWORTH, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5326. An act granting a pension to Maggie Alice Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5586. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5507. An act granting a pension to Mary Priscilla Allen, now Barry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5505. An act granting a pension to Kate M. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1065. An act granting an increase of pension to Bettie Lee Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9762. An act directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check drawn by E. B. Atwood, lieutenant-colonel and deputy quartermaster-general United States Army, in favor of Alfred C. Cass;

H. R. 5853. An act granting a pension to Mary Black; and

H. R. 8856. An act amending the act of August 15, 1894, entitled

"An act making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaties and stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895," and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1394. An act for the relief of Bvt. Col. Thomas P. O'Reilly;
S. 5585. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia;"

S. 5583. An act extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near Oacoma, S. Dak.; and

S. 3890. An act granting an increase of pension to Americus V. Rice.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, indefinite leave of absence is granted to Mr. GRAHAM, on account of a death in his family.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the president of the Capital Traction Company, transmitting a statement of the receipts and expenditures and a list of stockholders for the year ending December 31, 1900—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers relating to losses of property belonging to Messrs. H. B. Riden and William W. Thompson—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13633) to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes so as to permit the transportation by steam vessels of gasoline and other products of petroleum when carried by motor vehicles (commonly known as automobiles) when used as source of motive power, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2565); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, to which was referred the contested-election case of James A. Walker vs. William F. Rhea, from the Ninth Congressional district of Virginia, reported a resolution, No. 397, accompanied by a report (No. 2566); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10454) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend sections 5191 and 5192 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2567); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13732) to authorize the Bradshaw Mountain Railroad Company to construct a railroad through forest reserve and public lands of the United States in Yavapai County, Ariz., to Crowned King and other mining camps in said county, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2568); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13865) relative to the suit instituted for the protection of the interests of the United States in the Potomac River Flats, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2569); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13108) to amend an act to regulate gas works, approved June 23, 1874, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2570); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12513) to provide for the establishment of a port of delivery at Saginaw, Mich., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2574); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5404) to extend the privileges provided by an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880, as amended, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2575); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13673) granting a pension to Christina Heitz, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2538); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7688) granting a pension to Katy Kurth, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2539); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13725) granting a pension to Emily Sullivan Knight, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2540); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHAW, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12545) granting an increase of pension to William M. Strobe, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2541); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13556) granting an increase of pension to William H. Shaffer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2542); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13386) granting a pension to Martin Uehlein, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2543); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13329) granting a pension to Grotius N. Udell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2544); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12939) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Kerstetter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2545); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13617) granting an increase of pension to George W. Parker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2546); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13568) granting an increase of pension to James Hickey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2547); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12813) granting increase of pension to William Rea, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2548); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12634) granting a pension to Helen M. Evans, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2549); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12507) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Dawson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2550); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12405) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Briscoe, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2551); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12280) granting a pension to Emil Frank, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2552); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12273) granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Condon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2553); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10857) granting an increase of pension to Theophile A. Dauphin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2554); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10759) granting a pension to Margaret M. Walker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2555); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10169) for the relief of Betsey Jones, widow of Joseph Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2556); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHAW, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9330) granting a pension to Emma B. Taber, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2557); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9075) to pension Charles Dalrymple, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2558); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7995) to pension Jane Hunter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2559); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5615) for the relief of Margaret A. Stuart, of Mount Vernon, Tenn., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2560); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3648) to increase the pension of Charles W. Little, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2561); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1533) for the relief of Peter T. Norris, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2562); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1176) granting a pension to Justus Canfield, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2563); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8636) for the relief of the heirs of William Freeman, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 396), accompanied by a report (No. 2564); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11089) for the relief of George W. King, of Washington, D. C., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2571); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13068) to waive and release all claims of the United States by way of escheat to the real estate in the District of Columbia of which Patrick Kavanagh or his sons, Charles W. Kavanagh and William Kavanagh, died seized, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2573); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10819) for the relief of Esther A. Keyser, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 2572); which said bill was ordered to lie on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13654) releasing unto W. J. Cosgrove, Mary Cosgrove, Mary Ellen Cosgrove, and Annie Cosgrove any rights the United States may have in certain lands in Pensacola, Fla.; and the same was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 13928) to amend an act of Congress approved June 19, 1878, entitled "An act regulating exemptions in the District of Columbia"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 13929) to establish a national military park at Washington's Crossing, New Jersey and Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 13930) for the payment of travel allowances, on discharge from the Volunteer Army, to certain officers and enlisted men who reentered the military service of the United States in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 13931) to authorize certain municipal improvements in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 13932) for the establishment of a life-saving station on Bogue Banks, near Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 13933) to prevent and punish desecration of the flag of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 13943) to authorize the establishment at Corpus Christi, Tex., of a station for the investigation of problems connected with marine fishery interests on the South Atlantic coast—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 13947) increasing the limit of cost of certain public buildings, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a resolution of the senate of Nebraska, favoring bill providing for schools of mines in States where not already established—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 13934) granting a pension to Mrs. Catherine Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 13935) for the relief of Robert B. Stubbs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 13936) granting a pension to Mrs. Helen A. B. Du Barry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 13937) to reimburse Myron C. Tice—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 13938) granting a pension to Patience L. Rosa Archer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 13939) granting an increase of pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 13940) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13941) for the relief of the heirs of Robert L. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 13942) for the relief of Thomas Whittaker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 13944) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas F. Lindersmith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13945) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Rankart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 13946) for the relief of J. W. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of Journeymen Bricklayers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of Senate bill No. 727, known as the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Protest of the Forsythe Mercantile Company, J. J. Cater, T. E. Fletcher, S. D. Mobley, J. A. Huddleston,

and 80 other citizens of Forsythe, Ga., against the establishment of the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELL: Petitions of citizens of Alaska, for the construction of Government telegraph line and road from Port Valdes to Eagle (Fort Egbert), Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of the Boulder Medical Society, of Boulder, Colo., favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 5083, increasing the pension of Charles Ambrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Colorado Springs and Georgetown, Colo., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Frances Willard Union and United Presbyterian Church of Colorado Springs, and Methodist Episcopal Church of Hooper, Colo., and others, for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Concord quarterly meeting of the Religious Society of Friends at Westchester, Pa., for peace with the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of Josiah Strong, president of League for Social Service, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORLISS: Petition of H. M. Miller and 7 other citizens of Detroit, Mich., in favor of irrigation for the benefit of the Pima and Papago Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of Helen A. B. Du Barry, of the District of Columbia, for relief—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: Petition of C. D. Renick and 72 other citizens of Rockville, Ind., favoring the repeal of stamp tax on checks, drafts, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of citizens of Maplewood, N. J., remonstrating against any change either of postmaster or location of office at that place—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of T. H. Tomlinson and other citizens of Plainfield, N. J., in behalf of Patrick Reville, a suspended letter carrier—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Summit, Elizabeth, and of the Eighth Congressional district of New Jersey, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy, and other reform measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of the Women's Christian Association of Omaha, Nebr., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolutions of Journeymen Bricklayers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of Senate bill No. 727, known as the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Margaret A. Thompson, of Portsmouth, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 13413, for the relief of the heirs of Robert Green, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Henry Shultz and 73 others, of Lima, Ind., in favor of the anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER: Petition of Women's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of Freeport, N. Y., favoring provision for an adequate and permanent supply of water for the Pima and Papago Indians—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Yaphank, N. Y., favoring legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicants to dependent peoples—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Paper to accompany House bill No. 11273, for the relief of John G. Shacklett—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY: Affidavits of Thomas Whittaker, M. P. Blair, S. Bryson, P. H. Brown, and Mrs. M. S. Ray, to accompany House bill for the relief of Thomas Whittaker, of Logan County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of Isaac Prouty & Co., of Spencer, Mass., for the repeal of the tax of 15 per cent ad valorem on imported hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of J. B. Lippincott Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the continuance of the present law relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Orphanage of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Motor Vehicle Power Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill No. 5427, relating to the use of gasoline as a method of propulsion—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 31, 1901.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the Journal, and was interrupted by

Mr. STEWART. I ask that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

BRUNSWICK RIVER (NORTH CAROLINA) IMPROVEMENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 25th instant, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, reporting an estimate made by the local engineer officer, Capt. E. W. Van C. Lucas, Corps of Engineers, of \$1,000 for the work of removing an obstruction at the mouth of the Brunswick River, North Carolina; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel ship *Rebecca*, George Nowell, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a memorial of the National Live Stock Association, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fayette County, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the sale of firearms, intoxicants, etc., in the islands of the Pacific; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of 700 citizens of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the leasing of the public lands; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. KENNEY presented a petition of the Historical Society of Delaware, praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of the Valley Forge camping ground for use as a national military reservation; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of North Londonderry, N. H., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of White Lake, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service and to encourage the saving of life from shipwreck; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Exchange of Detroit, Mich., and a petition of the Detroit branch of the National League of Commission Merchants, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the repeal of the revenue-stamp tax on bank checks, telegraph messages, and express receipts; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of William H. Gore, of Detroit, Mich., and a petition of the United Brotherhood of Leather Workers of Flint, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics,